HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 312 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, June 11, 2018

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 11, 2018

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1100)

[*English*]

VISITABILITY

The House resumed from April 30 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak today to Motion No. 157. This motion recognizes the importance of visitability. It also prompts the government to address the topic of visitability in the accessibility legislation to be introduced in the House. These are important, much-needed measures. I am pleased to support this motion.

At one time, disabled persons often led a segregated existence. Society did not accommodate them well. Those old attitudes really started to change after the First World War. Thousands of heroic veterans suffered debilitating injuries in that bloody conflict. They lost body parts. They were rendered blind or deaf. When they returned, they simply needed to be accommodated. It forced people to finally start thinking about the needs of the disabled.

U.S. President Roosevelt took great efforts to hide his own disability. He did not want to be seen as weak. He had an agreement with the media never to take pictures of him looking like he was disabled, so as not to appear to be weak. There are plenty of reminders from history that attitudes can take a long time to change. As far as I can tell, visitability is a neologism. It is a great addition to our vocabulary. Visitability is a measure of a place's ease of access for people with disabilities. I did a quick search of the word's etymology and found it had been used a few times in the 19th and 20th centuries, but in the past it did not mean what we are talking about today. The use of the word only spiked in the 21st century, and I am glad it did. It shows that our society is taking the needs of people with disabilities more seriously. We are talking about it more. We are really thinking about how to make the lives of those with disabilities easier and more equitable.

I am proud that our former Conservative government was part of that trend. The home accessibility tax credit allowed Canadians with disabilities or those over 65 to save 15%, up to $10,000, on renovations to their residence. That is a lot of money. It is a great help to people paying for walk-in bathtubs, wheel-in showers, and wheelchair ramps. It really makes a difference to anyone who needs ease of access and visitability. Measures like these are of great help to seniors, in particular, and allow them to continue to live their life to the fullest and often much longer in their own residence where they would prefer to be. The second credit, the home renovation tax credit, was introduced in 2009. One in three households took advantage of it. It saved three million Canadians an average of $700. That is an incredible number of people opting to take advantage of that federal program. It really demonstrates that Canadians appreciated it. We had intended to make that credit permanent. Those credits made a big difference and supported visitability, so I am happy to see this motion would encourage the government to continue in the same vein.

This motion highlights sound practices and accessible construction with a specific nod to visitability. I know the construction industry has made enormous strides in building more accessible venues. At one time, such considerations were an afterthought, which was a shame. Today, businesses would not build a new storefront without considering the needs of those who might need greater accessibility. Municipalities also deserve a tremendous amount of credit. They have really shown leadership in making their jurisdictions more accessible and improving visitability. Municipalities have often taken leadership in demonstrating what is most needed for their citizens, and I applaud municipalities for doing this. In my riding of Bow River, many municipalities have done incredible work in this regard, so it is great that we are recognizing this positive trend and encouraging those who have not yet adopted it to get on board.

We want the future to be accessible to everyone, and I am pleased the House is taking action to endorse this positive future. We all know someone who could benefit from promoting greater visitability. There is not one member in this place representing a riding without constituents whose lives would not be made richer, much better, and more accessible.

● (1105)

I hope the Minister of Sport and Persons with Disabilities indeed addresses this topic of visitability in the upcoming accessibility legislation. We need the legislation. It has been two and a half years. We understand it needs to be introduced soon for the government to get it done. This is an incredibly important matter. It is a non-partisan issue I hope all parties can agree upon. We have been waiting for this act for a long time, two and a half years to three years, and we need it soon.

However, there are numerous other bills before the House the government has waited far too long to introduce. Many of them are complicated and make enormous changes to important issues like criminal justice and electoral reform. This is an important issue for many people in our society. The government has had a challenge with its legislative agenda, so here we are trying to rush through debate on this private member's motion, which should take priority. The government should have devoted less time to omnibus bills and put this one on the books so we could all support it.

I know we have been through many ministers of sport and persons with disabilities. There seems to have been a bit of upheaval there, but hopefully now the file will be stabilized and the minister will be able to move this forward. The people need to know that the government has not forgotten them. The people need visitability. This legislation needs to be introduced, and soon. I hope this motion will finally get the government to focus on this important file. I thank the member for Tobique—Mactaquac for introducing it.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by saying how much I respect the member who is sponsoring this motion, which we will support. I have enjoyed spending time with my colleague on numerous occasions, and I think he does excellent work, especially on the agriculture file. I thank him for moving this motion and for working so hard to promote visitability. I agree with him that all Canadians, regardless of age or physical ability, should be able to live and age at home.

However, I also encourage the sponsor of the motion to exert more pressure on ministers to introduce an accessibility bill soon. Many groups across the country have been waiting for that for a very long time. An accessibility bill could include visitability as part of a more comprehensive approach.

I listened to the debate that occurred after Motion No. 157 was moved, and I recall my colleague, the member sponsoring the bill, making the following comments on April 30:

> Motion No. 157 is meant to introduce the concept of minimum accessibility measures designed to accommodate everyone, including our aging demographic, allowing individuals to stay in their homes for as long as they so desire, and to address the high population of persons with a disability in Canada....

I think it is therefore essential that visitability be one of the many elements of the planned accessibility legislation. The government has been holding consultations for the development of its accessibility legislation since 2016, and while I am aware that the party opposite wants to get this right, after eight months of consultation, 18 public meetings, one youth forum, and nine thematic round tables, not to mention an online survey and input from 90 organizations, I think it is time for the government to table a bill.

The public consultations are over, and the minister's report was released in May 2017. That is a little over a year ago. I am actually astonished that this government did not plan to make an announcement during National AccessAbility Week, which was from May 27 to June 2. I hope the government will not wait until the next National AccessAbility Week to launch its bill.

The Liberals have been in office for almost four years now. The government had announced that it would table its accessibility bill in February 2018. There are only a few days left before the summer break, and there is nothing about this bill on the schedule before adjournment. I also encourage my colleague to urge the government to invest in this area, because there was nothing in the last budget for the planned accessibility bill or for visitability initiatives.

I want to talk about accessibility because I believe that it is time to do more. Our population is aging, and we have known for a long time that the unemployment rate among persons with disabilities is far higher than that for the general population. According to Statistics Canada, the placement rate for people with disabilities was 49% in 2015, compared to 79% in the general population. Advocacy groups are hoping that the new accessibility legislation will offer practical solutions to the very real problems experienced on a daily basis.

James Hicks, the national coordinator of the Council of Canadians with Disabilities, said that the consultations were more an airing of grievances than a forum for tabling ideas on how to bring about change. Now he hopes the new legislation will go beyond merely aspirational statements, which is what we would like to see, too.

Universal accessibility is a fundamental right that affects not only persons with disabilities, but also seniors and people with temporary mobility issues, such as someone using crutches because of a broken leg. We also need to think about parents with strollers, people with chronic pain, and so on. The concept of universal visitability applies to many different groups of people.

I would like to commend the City of Saint-Hyacinthe for all of the work it has done over the past 20 years, since 1998, in order to make our city more accessible for everyone. I worked on that file myself when I was a city councillor for the Saint-Sacrement district and was responsible for accessibility to municipal goods and services.

● (1110)

In 2011, the City of Saint-Hyacinthe, in co-operation with the Table de concertation des organismes œuvrant auprès des personnes handicapées, undertook an initiative to identify problems and implement the necessary solutions. I participated in that initiative as the head of that organization.

Since then, municipal departments have implemented hundreds of measures. They made street parking with timed meters free for anyone with a mobility impairment parking permit, they implemented the Voisins secours program to help residents during emergency evacuations, they installed automatic door openers on many municipal buildings, and they made parks more accessible for strollers, walkers, and wheelchairs.

I now look forward to contributing as a federal MP through legislation on accessibility and visitability.

My colleague will be pleased to learn that Saint-Hyacinthe has 18 municipal sites and 140 properties that are visitable. Thanks to our ongoing efforts, collaborative plans, and partnerships with many organizations, Saint-Hyacinthe and Acton Vale have made great strides in improving visitability and accessibility for seniors and people with reduced mobility or disabilities.

I also want to acknowledge the organizations in my riding that work hard every day on improving accessibility. I am thinking of, for example, the association of parents of children with disabilities in Richelieu-Val-Maska; the handicapped transportation service in Acton Vale; the Maskoutain paratransit users group, RMUTA; the umbrella group for paratransit services in the Saint-Hyacinthe and Acton Vale region; Parrainage civique, a citizen advocacy group in the Acton RCM and Maskoutains RCM; the St-Hyacinthe-Acton MS Society; the Richelieu-Yamaska disability associations groups, commonly referred to as GAPHRY; and Zone Loisir Montérégie. I am very proud of the work of all of these organizations.

I have the honour of representing an extraordinary organization, the citizen advocacy group in the Acton RCM and Maskoutains RCM, which is celebrating its 35th anniversary. Parrainage civique is a non-profit organization whose mission is to improve the social participation of persons with intellectual or physical disabilities, or persons living with autism spectrum disorder, by pairing them up with volunteers and through integration and awareness activities.

I am very proud to have worked there. I want to thank the following people for their exceptional work: Chantal Lavallée, the executive director of Parrainage civique, and the members of the board of directors, namely Serge Cabana, Jacques Julien, Paul St-Germain, Sophie Martin, Irénée Chênevert, Éric Rivard, and Carole Martin. Thank you to Parrainage civique, and happy 35th anniversary.

I would like to thank my colleague once again for his motion, which we will be supporting, because all levels of government must promote accessibility and visitability.

In my speech, I spoke about the exceptional work of the cities of Saint-Hyacinthe and Acton Vale. In Quebec, the Office des personnes handicapées du Québec does an exceptional job of promoting universal accessibility. Every municipality is required by law to have a municipal councillor responsible for accessibility to goods and services. Every city must prepare an annual action plan for universal accessibility and provide a report to the Office des personnes handicapées du Québec. Municipal and provincial governments are on board, at least in Quebec.

It is therefore important that the federal government have an accessibility law to make sure that all organizations that we oversee ensure accessibility. Furthermore, we must ensure that our laws promote the visitability of every home because anyone could, some day, need greater accessibility in the home they live in. We should have this vision for all homes.

● (1115)

I sincerely hope that my colleague will be able to persuade his colleagues on the other side of the House and include this principle in the accessibility legislation that we are impatiently awaiting.

[*English*]

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Tobique—Mactaquac for giving me the opportunity to speak to his motion, Motion No. 157, about the importance visitability can have for all Canadians, of all ages and abilities, particularly persons with a physical disability, aging individuals, seniors, and their families in Canada.

I would like to highlight a couple of key benefits that visitability can bring to the senior demographic, specifically since my hon. colleague from Tobique—Mactaquac mentioned my motion calling for a national seniors strategy, Motion No. 106. This is something that must include the aspects of minimum standards for accessible housing.

Visitable homes can give the opportunity to welcome and include guests who use a mobility device, such as a wheelchair or walker, into residential homes, which would help reduce the isolation that can be experienced by seniors and persons with a disability and increase opportunities for social interaction and inclusive communities.

Also, as people age, visitable homes can help residents age in place and live at home longer, avoiding the necessity to move into an institutional setting. A house with a non-step entrance can also help reduce the number of falls and stairs-related injuries of seniors, which in turn would help save health care costs.

Visitable housing can reduce the length of hospital visits, something that seniors tend to experience more frequently than those who are younger. Because of accessibility features in the home, people can return home more quickly following an injury or a diagnosis of a mobility disability.

When visitability features are planned from the outset, costs can be negligible. Retrofits of a conventional home to make it visitable cost significantly more than making the building visitable from the outset. That is from the Canadian Centre on Disability Studies in 2017.

Speaking of costs, it is also important to note that incorporating visitability features in the design stage of building a new home reduces the cost of modifying the home to meet the changing accessibility needs of residents over the course of their lifespan. This means that the more I am aware of now, the better I can plan for my future when it comes to decisions about my home or in the event I need or wish to move homes.

Research from VisitAble Housing Canada indicates that, with planning, the cost of a non-step entrance can be less than $250, and wider doors are as little as $5 to $25. On average, in new home builds, main floor accessible bathrooms do not cost anything additional when planned properly.

I would also like to point out that there are additional low-cost visitable design features, as cited by the Canadian Centre on Disability Studies in 2017, which may be added to improve accessibility and the ability for all of us to age in place. They include lever door handles; lever kitchen and bathroom faucets; raised electrical outlets; lowered climate controls; lowered light switches; and reinforced bathroom walls for future installation of grab bars or ceiling track lifts. These are very important features to plan ahead for.

I have worked as a school board trustee for Conseil scolaire catholique du Nouvel-Ontario, as a municipal councillor in West Nipissing, and as a regional director of the Canadian Hearing Society, working closely with the March of Dimes and the CNIB. I understand and have seen first-hand the many struggles faced by the not-for-profit sectors and the clients they serve.

A couple of weeks ago, I had the honour of participating in the official launch of the valley community ramp project, thanks to the Access2all foundation and its co-founders Dan Lebrun and Nadine Law. Access2all is a not-for-profit community group based out of Greater Sudbury. Its mission is to promote an inclusive community by opening doors and removing barriers, as Motion No. 157 seeks to do. Access2all does this by donating custom-built ramps to the business community. However, this project would not be possible without the support and participation of many community partners.

● (1120)

[*Translation*]

This project was launched at Bitter Bill's Ice Cream Parlour in Val Caron. Those in attendance included enthusiastic students from the Grade 7-8 leadership group "Val Coeur On", led by Chantale Goudreau from École élémentaire Jean-Paul II, as well as partnership representatives from Cambrian College and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners Local 2486, in Azilda. All were present to celebrate the delivery of the donated custom built access ramp.

The students at École Jean-Paul II partnered with Access2all to see how they could help make their community more accessible. The students started off by doing an accessibility audit to see if there was a need in their community. They then chose a few businesses and organizations that they felt should be accessible to their peers, such as Bitter Bill's Ice Cream Parlour and Chico's Bowl and Sports Lounge, in the Valley.

The ramps were then painted and given to the organizations by the École Jean-Paul II students. All construction materials for these ramps were donated by local lumber stores, including Rona in Valley East. Thanks to the volunteers and all of the community partners, Access2All has been able to pursue this program.

There can be no doubt that this initiative has numerous benefits. For example, thanks to this project, little Katie, a student at Jean-Paul II elementary school, can now go get ice cream with her friends, something she could not do before, because the ice cream parlour did not have a wheelchair ramp.

Having worked in the non-profit sector and in accessibility, I strongly believe in building an environment that is accessible to all.

I commend Dan and Nadine for founding Access2all. It is a fantastic initiative. I also want to send out a special thanks to Jean-Paul II elementary school, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 2486, in Azilda, Cambrian College, Rona, and all the volunteers who made this project a reality. This initiative is a great example of the kinds of solutions and results that are possible when the community gets involved and works hard together. That is why Motion No. 157, the visitability motion we are discussing today, is so important.

● (1125)

[*English*]

There is no doubt that this initiative is a shining example of the solutions and results we can come up with when community leaders get together and work hard to ensure everyone has access to the services and activities in the community.

Motion No. 157 is important to all Canadians. Visitability is about social justice for all. It is about providing accessible places to all: our families, our communities, our neighbours, our seniors, people with an ability, and our young families.

Visitability is important. Motion No. 157 is important. It is about inclusivity.

I want to thank my good friend, the MP for Tobique—Mactaquac, for giving me the opportunity to speak to this motion, and the importance visitability can have for all Canadians, of all ages and abilities, particularly persons with a physical disability, aging individuals, seniors, and their families in Canada.

Meegwetch.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in solidarity with Canadians who are limited in their mobility due to age or disability. For this reason, I stand in favour of Motion No. 157, which calls upon the members of this House to recognize the importance of constructing homes in a manner that makes them accessible to all. Furthermore, it calls on the Minister of Science and Minister of Sport and Persons with Disabilities to address the topic of visitability in the government's accessibility legislation, which was promised more than a year ago and has yet to be seen by this place.

Canada has been a world leader in creating accessible public spaces for those who live with a disability. The previous Conservative government invested heavily through the enabling accessibility plan to retrofit existing public facilities to provide greater access for all Canadians. From small retrofit projects to major community facilities, this program helped build a more accessible Canada for all. It was the right thing to do to make community spaces more inclusive of every single Canadian.

The concept of visitability, as presented in the motion we are discussing here today, takes accessibility to a new level by essentially calling on the federal government to legislate new building codes with regard to residential construction. For those who are not familiar with the concept of visitability, the term refers to single-family or owner-occupied housing designed in such a way that it can be lived in or visited by people who have trouble with steps or who use wheelchairs or walkers. At a minimum, it means three things: one, an entrance to the house without steps; two, doorways and hallways made 32 inches wide; and three, a main-floor bathroom that is accessible by someone who uses a wheelchair. Unless someone has a disability or knows someone who has a disability, most people would not take these things into consideration.

While it is crucial for us to pursue measures throughout society that increase accessibility, it is also important for us to remember that changes like these cost builders, and therefore homeowners, additional money. This could potentially place additional financial strain on homeowners who do not require the suggested changes. In particular, I am thinking of the financial implications this could have for young, first-time homebuyers. Furthermore, the building restrictions associated with visitability would take away choice in home design. For example, split-level entries would no longer be an option, which, of course, takes that away from the consumer. It is therefore incumbent upon this House to study the impact of the proposal outlined in Motion No. 157 before implementing it.

That said, there is a lot to be said about constructing homes with the features required to comfortably accommodate someone with a disability. It is not just about the present; it is also about the future.

Canada's population is aging. In fact, by 2031, about 23% of Canadians could be seniors, and as a general rule, a person's mobility tends to decrease with age. For the most part, seniors want to stay in their homes. They want to age in place. Constructing homes without stairs to the front door, with wider doorways and hallways, and with a wheelchair-accessible bathroom on the main floor would facilitate a person's ability to stay in his or her home longer. For this reason, it makes sense for contractors and architects to plan for the future when they design homes.

This motion talks about implementing visitability in federal accessibility legislation. Despite significant national consultations conducted across the country in 2016 and a promise to have legislation before the House by Christmas 2017, we still have not seen any action by the current government. The summary of the consultations was completed in May of 2017, which was more than year ago. Many people are wondering why the government has failed to deliver on its promise.

The Prime Minister has repeatedly stated that solutions to social challenges are merely a matter of political will. On that front, I guess the current government has communicated its political will loud and clear. The government is focused on legalizing marijuana, reducing sentences for violent crimes, destroying good-paying jobs in the oil and gas sector, and making life less affordable by implementing a carbon tax. The Liberals appear to care more about attacking Canadians than about making life more affordable and more accessible to those who live with a disability.

In fact, the current government is so committed to stripping Canadians of their rightfully earned wages that it recently voted against my colleague's bill regarding opportunities for workers with disabilities. This legislation would have ensured that people with disabilities would always benefit from their work. Right now, that is not the case. When people with disabilities start earning income, they not only pay taxes but also face sharp clawbacks of their income, medication, and housing supports, and other supports, meaning that they can lose more than they gain from getting a job, earning a raise, or working more hours.

● (1130)

Linda Chamberlain shared her story with the Toronto Star, which wrote, "After three decades of battling schizophrenia and homelessness and poverty, Chamberlain finally got a job." As a reward, the government increased the cost of Linda's rent by nearly 500%. They also cut her disability payment, making her $260 per month poorer because she got a job. As a result, she had to quit her job and choose to remain poor.

This is a huge problem. It is a glitch in our current system, and it is one that could have been addressed by the private member's bill that was brought forward by my colleague from Carleton.

The problem with the way the system is currently structured is that it not only forces people to live a life of poverty but also demoralizes them. It was incredibly disheartening, then, to watch members of the Liberal Party rise in this place and vote no to this common-sense motion that advocated for the rights of people who live with a disability.

As Conservatives, we understand that actions speak louder than words. We may not be as great at flashy photo-ops and selfies, but we certainly delivered significant assistance to those who live with a disability. We increased investments in skills training and employment opportunities so that persons living with a disability could be empowered to earn a living. We increased the working income tax benefit, which put more money in the pockets of those living with a disability who were working part-time or at minimum wage jobs. We also created the registered disabilities saving plan, which allows the parents of a person with a disability to save for the future needs of their children. Under the Harper Government, Canada became a much more inclusive place, a place that treated people who live with a disability with greater dignity, respect, and honour.

While the Liberal's record very clearly shows that the government does not prioritize people living with a disability, I am happy to support the motion before the House in the hope that perhaps the Liberals will turn from their hypocritical tendencies and actually take action.

Equal opportunity is a key tenet of conservatism. We want to give everyone the opportunity, regardless of circumstance, to build a better life. We support this motion, but beyond words, we want to see action on this file.

The Liberals like to use words like "compassion" and "inclusion", but the action for persons with disabilities is not there. It was the same story for the Canadian autism partnership. After years of work from every significant stakeholder in the autism community, the model for the Canadian autism partnership was finally ready to launch. Instead, all the hard work went to waste, as the Liberal government refused to fund it.

For one-tenth of the cost of this weekend's G7 summit in Quebec, the Liberals could have provided national leadership on research and treatment for autism. However, apparently, the autistic community was asking for more than what the government was able to offer.

Similarly, Canada's veterans, many of whom live with a disability, have been left in the cold by the government. In fact, at a recent town hall, the Prime Minister stated that injured veterans are asking for more than the government can afford to give. Meanwhile, the Prime Minister has enough money to pay a convicted terrorist $10.5 million. Also, he has enough money to increase foreign aid spending by $2 billion, not to mention his tax-funded vacations to the Caribbean and India.

In conclusion, the motion before the House serves as a statement of intent, but if we have learned one thing over the last two and a half years of the current government, it is that intent does not equal action.

In support of those living with a disability, we call upon the government to stop talking and start delivering. Perhaps it can start with this motion.

● (1135)

Hon. Kent Hehr (Calgary Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud the member for Tobique—Mactaquac for his visionary motion. I believe it is the first time visitability has been discussed in this honourable place, and it is an idea whose time has come. As a person who has had a disability for the last 28 years, I can say that visitability would have made a great deal of sense if it had been there 28 years ago. Now that we are discussing it here in this place, I hope that it can lead to more opportunities for people with disabilities and exceptionalities to live even fuller lives in Canada.

Visitability means three things. The first is that we need to be able to get in the door. That means a no-step entry. There have been countless times when I have wanted to get into someone's home, building, or place of business and there has been a step or some other impediment to being allowed to participate. I know it does not seem like a lot, but with visitability being at the fore, we too would be able to participate more in Canadian society.

The second thing visitability means is that we need clear passages. They have to be roughly 32 inches across for people to make it down hallways, whether they are using wheelchairs, scooters, or other mobility devices to move around the floor of a building.

The third thing is an accessible washroom. What good is a place if one has to go back home to go to the washroom?

Those three simple things would allow a person's home or business to be called "visitable". I think these are things Canada needs, with one in seven Canadians having a disability. That is roughly 14.4% of our population. That number is only going to rise with our aging population.

This is an idea that could really have major impacts on people's lives. It would be a cost-effective way of including people with disabilities in the Canadian fabric. Designing new homes this way would be more cost-efficient than retrofitting. When planning a neighbourhood or a business community, this could be incorporated into the mix to allow people to participate and to welcome guests with wheelchairs and mobility devices. It would allow an increase in social inclusion.

It could help seniors age in place. How many times have we seen people, when they get older, having to look for another place to live, because their current place does not meet their needs?

An interesting fact for those who want to live to be 75 years old, and I would guess that most of us do, is that 50% of people over the age of 75 will have a physical disability of one kind or another. We can see how visitability, if it was built right into our homes, would not only save costs for people going forward but would allow them to age in place in the community where they have built their lives.

It could also reduce hospital stays. Twenty-eight years ago, when I had my spinal cord injury, I spent roughly seven months in the hospital. I could probably have left two months earlier, but there was simply no place to go. There was no affordable, accessible, visitable place for me, a Canadian with a disability, to go. There was no room at the inn, so to speak. This is a real need that has to be addressed in our communities. In fact, if we look at the Calgary rental market, only 1% of housing in Calgary is both accessible and affordable. This gap affects almost 90,000 people.

● (1140)

We need to move forward on this. I will note that this is much of the reason why we are moving forward on the national housing strategy that will allow for more people with disabilities and exceptionalities to find a place to live. I am very pleased to see that some of these solutions are already being addressed in Calgary, as we saw in the opening this weekend of Inclusio. It is a place for 45 people with disabilities who meet an income threshold and who will now be able to live in their communities with an ability to get the help they need to live a fuller, more broad, more complete life.

These are important steps forward that are met by having a visitability structure to our way of living. There are communities out there right now that are implementing this strategy. I believe there is a community in Manitoba that has completely designed their housing structures to allow for the visitability structure, to allow for people to come and share the time together in their communities, to make things go forward.

I know with our national housing strategy, how we implement concepts like visitability is going to be very important going forward. There is no doubt that the one in seven Canadians with a disability right now do not have opportunities to live in the community at the same rate as other people. I know this is one thing I am very proud of this government for moving on: the national housing strategy and how we are going to include people with disabilities and exceptionalities, ensuring that they, too, have an ability to take part.

It is not only for people with disabilities that this makes sense. There is a whole broad range of other people who would be able to find society more easy to navigate. We can see that with people who want to have a stroller, a young mother or young father moving their children throughout the community, having that going into a home simply makes sense.

If we look around the community, we can see that visitability is an idea that's time has come. I applaud the member for Tobique—Mactaquac for his visionary work on this front. Hopefully this will be brought into more places and more stations as a way to allow for more people to take part in their community.

● (1145)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Eva Nassif (Vimy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to participate in the debate on Motion No. 157 and to emphasize how important it is for Canadian society. Even though Canada has always been ahead of the curve in creating an inclusive environment, there is still a lot of work to do. According to Statistics Canada, one in seven Canadians lives with a disability that limits their daily activities. Even so, the evidence shows that there is still a widespread lack of access to urban environments, roads, and housing.

This continues to prevent Canadians with reduced mobility from participating fully and equally in our society. I believe the member for Tobique—Mactaquac has a vision for Canada and that solutions exist. This motion affirms that vision by calling on the government to act. I share his vision, and I believe it can help change things.

Adopting the visitability motion will bring about major change in more ways than one. This motion will not only improve physical access, but also, over time, help reduce obstacles to communications and other social and behavioural barriers. The people who would benefit from government actions that honour the spirit of this motion will be recognized in our conversations and our decision-making. Ultimately, that will help remove the socio-economic barriers they face.

By addressing this issue through accessibility legislation, the minister would demonstrate our government's leadership on this matter, and also raise public awareness while highlighting just how many Canadians are still facing discrimination and disadvantages related to mobility issues. Awareness helps encourage social responsibility and recognizes that all individuals must be supported and given the opportunity to achieve and exercise their autonomy without being impeded by inaccessible places, when we have the capacity and the resources to accommodate them.

The concept of visitability will improve the quality of life of all Canadians, not just people with a disability, but also seniors, parents pushing strollers, pregnant women, children, and visitors who use mobility devices. Seniors are also very vulnerable to the structural barriers that the concept of visitability is meant to address. It is estimated that approximately 43.4% of Canadians 65 and older suffer from pain, vision loss, or loss of agility, causing them to restrict their activities. More specifically, one-third of Canadians 65 and older face difficulties in their daily activities because of mobility issues. This is a problem we need to acknowledge, because it will eventually affect us all.

When people start to age, their home can become an uncomfortable environment. When home layouts become increasingly difficult to use and no longer meet the needs and requirements of the residents, the latter can no longer access their homes or use them as well as they once did. With the new physical and sensory changes that happen naturally with age, our homes, which were once comfortable, start to become a barrier. Climbing the stairs can become difficult, hallways that were once easy to navigate do not accommodate wheelchairs or walkers, and the absence of a main floor bathroom can be a challenge.

These situations make seniors somewhat disabled by exposing them to risks of serious and potentially fatal injuries. All these factors can force us to spend our final years in an institutional setting equipped with ramps, bars, and no-step entryways. It is not enough to have government-run institutions that meet these requirements. We have to structure our society in such a way as to make all places accessible.

Elder abuse is a growing problem in Canada. The safety of seniors is an issue that family members have to take into consideration when choosing a retirement home or a palliative care home for their loved ones.

● (1150)

Ensuring that visitability standards are included in the construction of new homes will allow Canadians of all ages to live and age in their homes.

I would also like to take this opportunity to shed light on the impact that visitability can have on women. At present, it is estimated that approximately 53% of all people living with a disability in Canada are women, and that the levels of violence and abuse experienced by women with a disability are also the highest of all groups in Canada.

Inaccessibility means that it is difficult and sometimes impossible for women to attend meetings where information is exchanged and decisions are made. Women with reduced mobility and their families may refuse invitations to places that are difficult to access. Economic insecurity and inaccessibility, which are common among women with a disability, can lead them to live in places where there is no basic accessibility or to remain in precarious situations where they cannot exercise their autonomy because they depend on their partner or family. Single mothers who have children with a severe disability and who cannot afford accessible housing or cannot visit their families run the risk of not getting the help they often need. Visitability is crucial in order to promote full social inclusion of all women.

In order to empower women and ensure that they are able to participate in society in a fair and equal manner, we need to continue to focus on accessibility. Including these necessary accessibility standards will presumably have a significant impact. It is also important to realize that, as we work to achieve this objective, we will strengthen our commitment to making the changes that vulnerable Canadians desperately need.

We know that the federal government is working with the provinces and territories and providing funding through various means to make projects that are currently on the table a priority and to help the provinces and territories get the funding they need to launch these projects. That is why the third point set out in Motion No. 157, "inviting the federal government to address the subject of Visitability with its provincial and territorial partners in upcoming Federal, Provincial and Territorial discussions", is so vital.

Visitability should be taken into consideration as we move forward with affordable housing projects by focusing on seniors and people with disabilities. All levels of government can work together so that the most vulnerable members of our society are better taken care of and so that they can have the best possible quality of life.

What is more, funding for accessibility in general is incredibly effective and has helped communities restructure and remodel their facilities to accommodate people who would not otherwise have access to certain locations.

Accessibility in private spaces is just as important as accessibility in public spaces, and this is something I want to emphasize today. The needs of Canadians who require greater accessibility reflect those of our communities. Accessibility standards and principles of inclusiveness could and should be incorporated into a project's development and funding, as the sponsor of this motion, the member for Tobique—Mactaquac, pointed out.

I strongly support this motion, because I know what kind of impact it can have for people , in particular the most vulnerable Canadians, who simply cannot go certain places because our communities are unable to meet basic mobility needs.

I want to conclude by congratulating Mr. Perreault, the CEO of StimuleArts, a not-for-profit in my riding of Vimy, who does amazing work with people with physical or intellectual disabilities.

● (1155)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: There remaining only five minutes in the time provided for private members' business this morning, we will go directly to the right of reply by the sponsor of the motion before the House.

The hon. member for Tobique—Mactaquac has up to five minutes.

Mr. T.J. Harvey (Tobique—Mactaquac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House today to speak for the second time to my motion, Motion No. 157, on visitability. I would like to express a gracious thanks to my colleagues on both sides of the House, all parties in fact, for speaking to and supporting this important motion, including the hon. member for Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, the hon. member for Windsor—Tecumseh, as well as the hon. member for Calgary Centre, to recognize the need for visitability, access for all, and the ability to age in place. This is a non-partisan topic. Supporting it through their kind words in first hour of debate and emphasizing the need for minimum standards of accessibility sends the right message to Canadians.

The need to work together for the benefit of Canadians of all ages and abilities and the need for increased accessibility nationwide is essential, and I thank them sincerely. Education on visitability is key, and our discussion should not end here.

I would also like to thank all those individuals and organizations that advocate for visitability and accessibility locally in my riding, in my home province of New Brunswick, and across Canada. Their work is so appreciated and important to us all.

In addition to calling on the government to support and promote the concept of visitability, the motion invites the government to raise the issue in future provincial and territorial discussions. The National Building Code is the model building code that forms the basis for the provincial building codes. Although visitability practices are not within federal jurisdiction, our government encourages the visitability of residential housing within provincial and territorial jurisdictions. I hope to see it included in the national accessibility legislation the minister wishes to present to Parliament.

The debate in the House has been successful in fostering meaningful discussion around the introduction of the topic of visitability. I hope to see those discussions brought forward with our provincial and territorial partners in future discussions.

The motion would also allow for an opportunity to emphasize the efforts of companies, contractors, and builders already applying the principles of visitability in their new constructions. I would like to commend these companies for their efforts and attention to pre-construction planning, as this type of housing is truly necessary if we are to age in place in a barrier-free society.

We need to ensure we all recognize and communicate to others that visitability is not just for the benefit of persons with a disability but for all Canadians, including seniors, families, persons without a disability, and all of us in this place. Bringing visitability before the House is not just for the benefit of persons with a disability but for everyone, which is in the spirit of inclusivity.

I congratulate my colleague, the hon. member for Newmarket—Aurora, for his dedication to accessibility through his statement last week on the importance of access for all, a true demonstration there is a trending and long overdue need for us to address our accessibility challenges nationwide. Most of all, including visitability practices in construction can no longer come as an afterthought.

Someone who has continued to emphasize this point is Canadian Paralympian, activist, philanthropist for persons with a disability, and someone we all know as the "Man in motion", Mr. Rick Hansen. He is a tireless advocate for accessibility in our country, one I am proud to say has supported the motion by stating:

> Physical accessibility is a fundamental barrier for people with disabilities. Something as simple as the expectation to stay in your home as long as you want to is just one example. This is why I support Motion M-157 in helping ensure that homes are accessible and inclusive, providing greater independence and quality of life for all Canadians.

This issue is particularly important to me, and the reality is that disability is likely to affect every one of us directly or indirectly throughout our lifetime. One in seven Canadians over the age of 15 has a disability, that is 3.8 million Canadians, and this will increase with an ever-aging population.

Our government has made a commitment to putting accessibility legislation forward. This motion has created an opportunity for visitability to become the cornerstone of the legislation. I very much look forward to seeing the impact visitability will have as we continue to build on the hard work that has already been done to date for the benefit of all Canadians and as we anticipate the tabling of legislation in the House this session.

This presents an opportunity for all of us in this place to do what is right and non-partisan. I hope for unanimous support on Motion No. 157 for the benefit of all Canadians.

I would like to conclude my remarks with a point made by an individual who originally brought the topic of visitability to the attention of the provincial non-profit, of which he is a board member, Ability New Brunswick. Mr. Courtney Keenan is a constituent from my riding, a friend, and a passionate advocate for accessibility.

● (1200)

Drawing from the disability statistics, which have been stated many times through these two hours of debate, given that 16.5% of the Canadian population has a disability and using the theory we all know as "six degrees of separation", the idea that all living things in this world are six or fewer steps away from each other, calculations would show that nearly 100% of the population is directly or indirectly impacted by disability and the need for accessibility.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, June 13, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1205)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—IRAN

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC) moved:

> That the House: (a) strongly condemn the current regime in Iran for its ongoing sponsorship of terrorism around the world, including instigating violent attacks on the Gaza border; (b) condemn the recent statements made by Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei calling for genocide against the Jewish people; (c) call on the government to (i) immediately cease any and all negotiations or discussions with the Islamic Republic of Iran to restore diplomatic relations, (ii) demand that the Iranian Regime immediately release all Canadians and Canadian permanent residents who are currently detained in Iran, including Maryam Monbeini, the widow of Professor Kavous Sayed-Emami, and Saeed Malekpour, who has been imprisoned since 2008; and (d) stand with the people of Iran and recognize that they, like all people, have a fundamental right to freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of thought, belief, opinion, and expression, including freedom of the press and other forms of communication, freedom of peaceful assembly, and freedom of association.

He said: Mr. Speaker, is Canada an indispensable country? Is our voice and influence necessary on the world stage? I believe it is, but in order for Canada's influence to matter, we must stand for something.

Our foreign affairs minister gave a speech about a year ago in which she asserted that Canada was an indispensable country, and yet she has failed to deliver a foreign policy that involves us standing for anything clearly or consistently.

In my motivating remarks for this motion, I am going to start by articulating the principles that we believe should animate Canadian foreign policy and then talk about the situation on the ground in Iran and the wider Middle East. It calls for the particular substantive Canadian response that we are proposing.

At a fundamental level, our party contends that Canada must have a principled foreign policy; that it is a foreign policy that stands for something. What does that mean?

Canada is a special place. We were founded as a free, bicultural society with religious freedom and diversities and with common laws and values. We chose to reconcile our diversity in the unity of one democratic political community from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth.

Out of that founding vision has grown the greatest nation on earth. We are free, prosperous, bold, creative, and kind. Our political culture is characterized by freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. We are diverse but we are great, not just because of our diversity but because of how we live together in the midst of that diversity, how we live out the maximum of St. Augustine, "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity."

That is Canada, an uncommon example of diverse people living together well. We are the exception that proves the rule, evidence that something outside the experience of many people around the world is in fact possible. This is who we are and this is what we seek to preserve here in Canada.

As we develop our foreign policy, we have two paths available to us. We can choose to stand as we are, true to ourselves and our own experience and seek to expand the space for freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law around the world. Or we can demure, speaking of our values as Canadian values but failing to assert that they are also universal human values, perhaps, and highlighting our own failures in the world in a way that gives comfort to human rights abusers elsewhere.

A principled foreign policy is one that seeks to apply our own domestic experience to make the world around us a better place. An unprincipled foreign policy would put a claim in the councils of the world and the approval of other nations ahead of our principles, preferring the appointment of envoys and the taking of photos to actual action on important files.

A principled foreign policy recognizes that the peoples of the world are no less deserving of freedom, democracy, human rights protections, and the rule of law than Canadians. Again, a principled foreign policy seeks to expand the space for these ideas. A serious, principled, strategic Canadian foreign policy that involves doing the right thing even when people are not looking can make a big difference.

Canada is part of most major non-regional international clubs, the G7, the G20, the Commonwealth, the Francophonie, etc. We do not have the natural challenges of being a super power. We do not have the baggage of colonial history beyond our borders. We have a domestic experience of reconciling diversity in a well-functioning federation. We can use our access and our experience to effectively seek the spread of our values around the world.

This is our opportunity, but we also face challenges. Fully projecting our influence requires us to do two things that do not normally come natural to us nationally. It requires us to be proud and it also requires us to be impolite.

It is fashionable among some Liberals today decry the rise of nationalism, without even qualifying or defining that term. Nationalism obviously has many negative manifestations, but nationalism properly oriented is the love of one's country and its natural virtues, a love of one's country that is not incompatible with love and goodwill to all, but a love that is grounded in and starts with one's most immediate community. In order to spread our experience around the world, we must first be proud of that experience and unafraid to speak about our greatness. We should be unapologetic about saying and showing the greatness of our political model. That is the basis on which we will spread it.

To be principled is also to be willing to be impolite when the situation calls for it. Are we the sort of country that wants to get along with everyone, or are we willing to risk our relationships, in the case of very bad actors, or risk not having relationships at all, in order to stand up for what is important? I think those suffering persecution around the world who want to see their own country become more like Canada would want us to be as effective as possible and as impolite as necessary in seeking to support and advance their legitimate aspirations.

● (1210)

Canada cannot be both a friend to the oppressor and a friend to the oppressed. We must choose. A timid foreign policy, lacking in sufficient pride and aggressiveness would be a friend to the oppressor. However, a Canada that understands the genesis of our own success, that is proud of what it is, that is bold, blunt, and even impolite when confronting abusers of human rights, would be a friend to those who need it. Surely, this should not be mistaken for a call to isolationism. It is fundamentally the opposite. It is a call to authentically carry ourselves into the councils of the world.

I moved a motion today specifically about Canada's foreign policy towards Iran. This motion calls for a a clear condemnation of the Iranian regime's aggression throughout the Middle East, including the sponsorship of terrorism, and specifically its support for Hamas during recent violent clashes on the Israel border. It calls for a clear condemnation of the Iranian regime's advocacy for a second Holocaust; that is, for the complete destruction of the world's only Jewish state. It calls for a response from the Canadian government to the actions of Iran, the total abandonment of its plan to negotiate the restoration of diplomatic relations with Iran, for aggressive and consistent advocacy for Canadians imprisoned in Iran, and for the designation of the so-called Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist entity under the Criminal Code. Finally, this motion calls for a recognition of the fundamental human rights of the Iranian people.

Some context here is important. The Iranian state is recognized by most nations in the Middle East as a clear and present threat to the security of the region. At a fundamental level, the Iranian regime does not operate like a normal state, accepting the strictures of sovereignty and diplomatic action in this age. It is rather a post-revolutionary state, seeking to spread its theocratic revolutionary doctrine and system through any and all means possible.

While Canada ought to seek the spread of freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law through a rules-based order that recognizes the inherent dignity of all human beings, Iran seeks to spread its particular brand of authoritarian theocracy through underhanded support to violent proxies. It seeks to wage war through its proxies against anyone in the way of its quest for complete dominance in the region, especially against Israel and Saudi Arabia.

This present conflict should not be misconstrued as a clash of civilizations or religions. In fact, countries in the region, other Muslim nations, generally see and experience a threat posed by Iran more clearly than do nations in the west. In the region, Iran is using proxies to infiltrate Iraq; it is supporting the Assad regime in Syria, and it is continuing to back Hezbollah in southern Lebanon. It is co-opting and using Houthis in Yemen to destabilize the country and attack Saudi Arabia, and it is supporting violent action by Gaza on Israel's border.

We, and other regional powers, are in something like a new cold war against Iran. The term "cold war" does not seem quite right in light of how hot it actually is. However, the current situation is analogous to the Cold War that we fought against the Soviets, insofar as Iran, a radical post-revolutionary state, is seeking to spread its revolution by backing violent proxies, and in some cases sending direct military aid. It is trying to spread its brand of revolutionary theocracy, and to encircle and undermine the security of those who it defines as its foes.

Of particular concern to Israelis, but also to Syrians, Iranians, Kurds, and other Middle Eastern people, is the attempt by Iran to open up and operationalize a northern corridor from Iran through Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon, covering Israel's northern border and stretching to the Mediterranean Sea. This corridor would give Iran the means to ferry weapons and equipment more easily back and forth between its proxies, sending more sophisticated weaponry to Hezbollah in southern Lebanon, and opening a second front against Israel from Syria.

Israel has highly sophisticated iron dome and anti-rocket technology. However, that does not eliminate the substantial risk presented by the proliferation of weapons in an Iran-controlled transportation corridor. The previous American administration had sought to constrain Iran's nuclear ambitions in exchange for sanctions relief. This strategy represented a laudable goal, but it did not engage sufficiently with the non-nuclear ways that Iran represents a threat to regional security, and the way that sanctions relief has enabled the regime to invest further in support of its terrorist proxies.

While Israel is a particular target of these northern corridor efforts, we must also recognize how harmful they are to the particular countries in the path of this Iranian regime's aggressive attack corridor. The people of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon have suffered enough already, yet their states and their rights are in different ways undermined by Iranian aggression. The Iranian regime, aided by sanctions relief, is developing greater capacity to undermine regional security through terrorism. It is not just developing capacity, it is repeatedly demonstrating a willingness to use that capacity.

A principled Canadian foreign policy would seek to join with our allies to counter Iranian aggression by doing all we can to prevent the regime from accessing the resources it needs to complete its strategic design, undermining other countries' sovereignty, and using them to attack our partners. The spread of Iranian regime-backed terrorism and instability throughout the region requires the clear and steadfast opposition of all free nations whose foreign policy is informed by principle.

● (1215)

I would like to turn now specifically to the situation in Gaza, and the role that Iran is playing. I recently had the opportunity to join members of the Canada-Palestine Parliamentary friendship group on a trip to the West Bank to observe the situation and engage in dialogue with the Palestinian leadership, civil society, and people. Palestinians are a warm and hospitable people. They deserve the same things that all of us do. I do not always agree with our hosts in the West Bank, but they profess a commitment to recognizing Israel's right to exist, and the pursuit of a peaceful two-state solution, including hard compromises on both sides. Conservatives in Canada seek the establishment of a free, democratic, rights-respecting, pluralistic, rule of law-based Palestinian state, living in peace with, and enjoying close co-operation with the Jewish state of Israel.

The situation in the West Bank under the Palestinian authority stands in marked contrast to the situation in Gaza. Gaza is fully controlled by Hamas, a terrorist entity which countenances no negotiation or peace with Israel. Some people have called Gaza an open-air prison. If that is the case, then Hamas is the jailer. Hamas's charter says the following, "Initiatives, and so-called peaceful solutions and international conferences, are in contradiction to the principles of the Islamic Resistance Movement." Then later, "There is no solution for the Palestinian question except through Jihad. Initiatives, proposals and international conferences are all a waste of time and vain endeavors." That is from the Hamas charter.

Lest there be any doubt of what they mean by the word "Jihad" in this context, the charter says later:

> The day that enemies usurp part of Moslem land, Jihad becomes the individual duty of every Moslem. In face of the Jews' usurpation of Palestine, it is compulsory that the banner of Jihad be raised. To do this requires the diffusion of Islamic consciousness among the masses, both on the regional, Arab and Islamic levels. It is necessary to instill the spirit of Jihad in the heart of the nation so that they would confront the enemies and join the ranks of the fighters.

No wonder there is such kinship between Hamas and the Iranian regime. Iran and Hamas are dedicated to the destruction of Israel, in effect to the bringing about of a second holocaust. The Hamas charter contains similar language to the recent tweet of Iran's supreme leader, who said, "Israel is a malignant cancerous tumor in the West Asian region that has to be removed and eradicated: it is possible and it will happen." This statement should clearly be understood as incitement to genocide. Insofar as the tweet specifically references the so-called "Great Return March", we should understand that this march on Israel's border is part of the mechanism that Hamas and Iran see for effecting the second holocaust that they desire.

The Palestinian people are the first victims of Hamas, and of the Iranian regime in this case, because they regard the Palestinian people as mere chess pieces in their cynical game against Israel. Hamas has used a series of tactics for targeting Israel, trying to inflict maximum suffering on Israelis, but with no concern for the associated cost to Palestinian people. The costs of this ongoing violence have included lost aid, collateral damage, and direct repression.

Hamas launches rockets into Israel, although these rockets can often be effectively countered with Israel's iron dome technology. Hamas uses aid and building materials to try to construct tunnels into Israel through which to launch attacks. Hamas has repurposed kites given as aid, intended to bring some joy to the children of Gaza, but that are repurposed into tools for setting fire to forests and fields in Israel. Hamas has organized marches on the border, combining civilians and militants, as they always do, but specifically with the intention of infiltrating and violently attacking Israel. The name of the event , "Great Return March", should make rather obvious that the intention is not to protest at the border, but rather to violently cross it.

When it comes to issues involving international peace and security, as well as advancing Canada's vital trade interests, Canada's Conservatives seek co-operation with the government whenever and wherever possible. However, we will not deign to criticize substantial wrongs by the government, which are at odds with our values and interests. The government's response to the so-called Great Return March has focused solely on criticizing Israel's response to it. We desire for multi-party unity and support for Israel's right to exist and defend itself, but Israel becomes an issue of partisan disagreement when this government makes statements that single Israel out and fail to identify the real instigators of violence in the region. We will not, in the name of so-called non-partisanship, demure to criticize the government when it fails to properly support our close allies.

Aside from the supreme leader's tweet, the Iranian role in these events should be eminently clear. The Palestinian ambassador to France has specifically identified the role of Iran in fomenting and supporting these protests in Gaza.

● (1220)

Iran and Hamas seek a second holocaust. My grandmother was a survivor of the first Holocaust, and she instilled in us the necessary sensibility towards those who threaten violence against the Jewish people. It is a sensibility rooted in that historic memory. When people say they are trying to kill us, believe that they mean it and stop them before it is too late. Never expect critics around the world to have the same commitment to our security that we do. Israel will not wait until it is too late to respond to Iran, and neither should we.

Our motion calls on the government not to seek resumption of diplomatic relations with Iran, and further to list the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist entity. I would like to turn now in particular to the importance of those measures.

The question of diplomatic ties with Iran is an important one, but one which is often misconstrued in terms of its actual impact. In cases where Canada does not have a diplomatic presence, we work to advance our interests and support Canadians in other ways. Everyone understands that there are workarounds and back channels that exist as part of international diplomacy.

Diplomatic relations are not merely a question about whether or not we have an ability to talk to each other. It is also a question of the status of our relationship and the degree to which we believe that mutual access to each other should be automatic. Should Iranian agents have the freedom to come to Canada easily and inevitably to work clandestinely to intimidate members of their own community and share intelligence back home? Should Iranian authorities be able to threaten Canadian diplomatic staff and property in Iran, as we have seen happen in other cases with nations that have disputes with Iran? Should we reward Iran's threats of genocide and instigation of violence in the region with an upgrading of relations?

It would have to be out of either willful blindness or in clear spite of our values and interests for us to pursue the reopening of diplomatic relations with Iran at a time like this. Pressing the reset button arbitrarily in the midst of worsening regime behaviour sends a perverse message about our intensity and our resolve to advance the things that we consider important. Rewarding bad behaviour is appeasement. It has never worked, and it will never work. Organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah which enjoy Iranian support and share its designs are rightly listed as terrorist organizations.

The government trumpets the importance of dialogue with extreme bad actors like the Iranian state, and yet accepts, in the listing of Hamas and Hezbollah, the principle that there are some people we should not be talking to, whose actions put them beyond the pale of even the legitimacy that comes with discussion, and that we are safer drawing a clear line in the sand. Insofar as we take this approach with Hamas and Hezbollah, it follows naturally and reasonably that we take the same approach with the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. The IRGC is almost certainly responsible, at a practical level, for more violence and mayhem than these organizations, and it shares values, objectives, and tactics with them.

What makes it different, of course, is an apparent link with a state, but it functions with a level of autonomy and independence that could well justify its recognition as a non-state actor. In any event, there is nothing in Canadian law to prevent the listing of state entities as terrorist entities, if in fact they are. It would be perverse to contend that we should sanction non-state entities involved in terrorism while seeking greater diplomatic ties with state entities that do the same thing.

Our motion concludes with an affirmation of the fundamental human rights of the Iranian people.

In the midst of efforts by the Iranian government to spread violence and terror throughout the region, the Iranian people have stood up and said no. A powerful protest movement broke out this past December and January, with protestors demanding political change and the emergence of a government that protects their rights and is on their side. Slogans included "Not Gaza, Not Lebanon, I give my life for Iran", and also "Death to the dictator". In other words, protestors were specifically and knowingly repudiating the grand design of their regime, and even calling for an end to the regime itself. In the midst of significant violence and repression, these protesters were a portrait of courage.

Some in the west will often cover Iranian politics as some legitimate contest between regime moderates and regime hard-liners, but the more important cleavage is between the supreme leader who holds all of the political power, and the people who seek more than simply the moderation of their environment, the gilding of their cage. They seek fundamental change.

In the midst of this, a Liberal MP referred to the Iranian government as "elected". I know many people in the community and the democracy movement found that offensive.

Political change in Iran is the most important and reachable strategic objective for us in the region. It would, in a moment, dramatically reduce the security threats posed to Israel and our other allies. It would open up a space for opportunity and prosperity. By weakening Hamas and Hezbollah, it would be a particular blessing to the people of Palestine and Lebanon. It would significantly increase the prospects of peace between Israel and Palestine, between Israel and Lebanon, in Syria, and in Yemen.

Most importantly, it would mark the extension of freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law to over 80 million people who do not presently enjoy it.

● (1225)

We, here in this House, today, have the power to do something about this, to constrain and isolate the Iranian regime, to support the Iranian people, and to work towards the perhaps imminent objective of a free Iran. In this struggle, our experience matters; our voice is indispensable.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member's motion touches on many different segments of the issue. Particularly, I would like to touch on two aspects.

First, I want to join in saying that we, the New Democrats, unequivocally condemn the comments by the Iranian cleric, as well as the comments by the supreme leader regarding the destruction of Israel and including, most recently, when he said that "Israel is a malignant cancerous tumor....that has to be removed and eradicated".

These comments are of course unacceptable and incite violence against an entire population. It is not a path that I think anybody in this House of Commons wants to see anywhere.

With that said, on the issue around establishing diplomatic relations with Iran, the Conservatives are arguing that Canada should not reward Iran with diplomatic re-engagement. The previous Conservative government did many arms trade deals with human rights abusing countries, like Saudi Arabia. Why is member's perspective that he is willing to engage with one human rights abuser but does not advocate for Canada trying to have a conversation with another?

Without diplomatic relations, there are challenges. On February 13 at the foreign affairs committee, Amnesty International, Alex Neve said:

> We do note that if diplomatic channels are open, it offers an avenue for advocacy, diplomacy, and more regular consular access, including in-person consular access from Canada rather than from a partner country. These options won't be there if the channels are closed.

Does the member not agree that we should actually engage in a conversation, even though we do not agree with Iran's perspectives?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, that is a legitimate and a good question. It is an important question to have some dialogue about.

I want to be clear that there are many countries whose human rights record I have criticized in this House. I have criticized China's human rights record; I have criticized Saudi Arabia's human rights record. I have not advocated breaking off diplomatic relations with those countries. There is a case for wisdom and strategy in terms of how we approach specific cases in order to maximize our effectiveness.

Iran is a special case for a number of reasons. One of them is that Iran does not play by the normal rules of diplomatic respect. There are multiple cases in which foreign embassies have been attacked inside Iran in response to criticism that has come from other countries over their record. How we do have a dialogue with Iran if it is the kind of country where there is a real threat to the safety of our diplomatic staff every time we speak out? That is not a reality in many other countries, but that is a situation we have seen in Iran, the repeated attacking of diplomatic properties and personnel.

The Conservative government broke off diplomatic relations with Iran at a time when there was a clear concern about security. We realized that we could not in fact guarantee the security of staff. In addition to all of these other issues, now would be the wrong time to reward Iran with the re-establishment of those relations especially in light of that.

I will just wrap up my response with this. Of course there are cases where we have somebody in Iran we want to get out, and the Iranian government has been unhelpful. However, we had the same problems previously. We had the case that has just happened, Professor Kavous Seyed-Emami, who was killed in an Iranian prison. We had the case of Zahra Kazemi at a time when Canada did have diplomatic relations with Iran.

The way in which Iran uses diplomatic relations to threaten Canadians and their embassy as a clandestine mechanism for exerting power outside of normal channels makes Iran a special case, and certainly, in any event, having had diplomatic relations broken off, now is not the time to reward Iran with that re-establishment.

● (1230)

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as a Conservative I am very proud of the history of the Harper government for standing for democracy, justice, and prosperity in free markets around the world. I believe this was beyond the former prime minister. It was something that extended to my predecessor, Jason Kenney. He fought very hard for these rights, as did the hon. John Baird. We had a fantastic powerhouse team that was committed to international democracy, human rights, and justice. Therefore, perhaps my colleague could give his thoughts on what we can learn in terms of promoting democracy, justice, free markets, and prosperity around the world from the previous Harper Conservative government.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question and for her service to Canada in the diplomatic world before now serving in the House.

I have spoken about the Middle East, so perhaps I will take another example outside of the Middle East to illuminate the point my colleague is making about the way the previous government approached these issues. When Russia invaded Ukraine, Canada, as a member of the G7, had an opportunity to try to drive the world consensus toward a strong response to that invasion. We were uniquely placed to do that. We have the close cultural connection with Ukraine because of our large diaspora community, but also we do not have the same economic ties with Russia that some of our European partners have. We do not have, in a sense, the same superpower plot line tension that exists between the U.S. and Russia. It meant we were well positioned to take a leadership role in speaking out against that invasion. We were able to say things that some of our international partners were less willing to say, but in the process we were able to build a consensus within the G7 for tougher sanctions than would have existed otherwise.

Some people were asking at the time why it really mattered that Canada speak out and how was it actually making a difference that Stephen Harper was making these strong statements on the issue of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. He was able to influence the conversation and the thinking in other countries through our membership in international organizations in a way that established this multilateral response.

Sometimes, we see on the other side of the House an emphasis on a principles-based approach as somehow characterized as isolationist, as saying we should not be out there engaging with people. We believe, on this side of the House, in the importance of being out there, but out there as Canada, out there in a way that is reflective of our values, of our own domestic experience of freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law, and of a recognition that that is not just a Canadian value, but a universal human value that we can spread.

In the case of Ukraine, in the case of our support for Israel, and support for other oppressed minorities around the world and the actions we are taking through institutions like the office of religious freedom and others to build capacity and encourage minority rights, some of this is the loud vocal stuff, like what happened with Ukraine. However, some of it is the small investments we make in, for instance, educational materials that encourage pluralism. They are reflective of our own experience here in Canada. We seek to partner with others to spread those values around the world. Those are the kinds of things we can and should be doing, not seeking the approval of others at any cost, but rather, seeking to be Canada and advance our voice on the world stage.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to say very clearly, the NDP supports diplomatic engagement, based on the principle that dialogue is the best path forward to peace and positive change. The decision to cut diplomatic ties with Iran shows perhaps a profound misunderstanding of what diplomacy is. Diplomacy is about advancing national interests and values and using dialogue to build better understanding and progressive change. It is not really about shunning others. Therefore, I would ask the member: If we do not engage in diplomatic channels, what other options do we have?

● (1235)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that even the NDP does not actually take the principle that the member just articulated all the way. I think all parties in the House support the listing of certain entities and organizations, for instance terrorist entities with whom we do not have diplomatic relations. I do not think anyone in the House proposed the opening of an embassy to Daesh during their heyday. To recognize that there is some extreme point beyond which we would not be talking or engaging, because to do so would give legitimacy, now leaves us at a point of just evaluating where exactly that line is. I think we would all agree that there is a line somewhere. We have to have some engagement with people we do not agree with, but we also have to recognize a point at which entities are beyond the pale. In the case of Iran, there is a threat to the security of our own diplomatic staff. Of course there are opportunities to talk through back channels when we need to, but diplomatic relations is not just about talking—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. We are out of time. We had slightly over a minute for that last exchange, so we are out of time.

I realize members pivot and direct their speech to different parts of the chamber, but from time to time, maybe they could check back here so that we're able to give some of those signals as to where the time is at that part of the period allowed for their comments.

The hon. Parliament Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is deeply committed to providing help to Canadians in distress abroad. As parliamentary secretary for consular affairs, I have spent the last two and half years focused on ensuring that Canadians abroad get the help they need from their government.

When Canadians are abroad, they want to know that they have a government at home that will provide them with the help they deserve, and a government that will fight for them; not a government that will be equivocal, not a government that will be selective, and not a government that will be partisan about standing up for their rights.

I am pleased to say that we are able to provide that help to many Canadians who find themselves in difficult situations in foreign countries every year.

Our government places the highest value on providing consular services to Canadians. We place a vital priority on helping Canadians in distress. No Canadian should be abandoned by their government, a point that I know the members opposite do not always agree with, and did not in fact act upon while they were in government.

Led by our Prime Minister and our Minister of Foreign Affairs, we have been very clear around the world throughout our bilateral meetings and multilateral meetings that consular issues are the highest priorities to our government.

In fact, I know that many world leaders are often surprised when our Prime Minister personally takes the time to raise consular matters during bilateral meetings. Foreign leaders are not accustomed to seeing a world leader dedicate time within a bilateral meeting, when there is a short time for a face-to-face encounter, to raise consular affairs. I am proud that our Prime Minister has taken leadership on this file.

I am sure I join with all of the members of the House when I express how deeply shocked and appalled I was when the world learned of the death of Canadian Iranian Dr. Kavous Seyed-Emami. Dr. Seyed-Emami was sociology professor, a dedicated environmentalist, and the founder of the Persian Wildlife Heritage Foundation.

The circumstances surrounding his arrest and detention have raised many important questions, which remain woefully unanswered. He was arrested by Iranian authorities and taken to the notorious Evin prison. His family found out two weeks later that Dr. Seyed-Emami died, and they were given the explanation of suicide.

We immediately called upon the Iranian authorities to answer those questions, and we continue to do so today. We need an independent investigation to examine the circumstances and the situation surrounding his death. We must have the truth in this case. There are too many questions left unanswered, and his family is still desperate for answers.

We immediately demanded details surrounding his detention and his tragic death. We are also shocked and appalled that Dr. Kavous Seyed-Emami's widow, Ms. Maryam Mombeini, continues to be denied the freedom to leave Iran. Ms. Mombeini is a Canadian citizen, and she wishes to return home to Canada. There is no reason why she should not be allowed to do so, and we call upon the Iranian authorities to grant her the freedom to return home immediately.

I have spoken with her sons on many occasions. Her sons have been able to return to Canada. In fact, I received them at the airport in Vancouver when they came back. I am grateful that they are back home and that they are safe, yet I can also understand what they are going through. They have lost their father, and they are unable to be joined by their mother, who has been barred from leaving Iran.

The decision by the Iranian authorities not to let her leave is unacceptable, and we have been taking every possible measure to address this terrible situation. In fact, we have said repeatedly, both in public and in private, that as long as Ms. Mombeini is not able to leave Iran, the focus of any discussions with Iran will be on getting her home to Canada. That has been the focus of every interaction that the Government of Canada has had with the Iranian authorities, and I can say to the members opposite that this continues to be the firm case today.

● (1240)

The Minister of Foreign Affairs has spoken on several occasions with Ms. Mombeini, as well as her sons in Canada, to reassure them of our strong commitment to resolve this unacceptable situation. I have spoken with the sons as well and I have reassured them that the government stands by them unequivocally.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs has raised this issue directly with Iranian authorities. Just two weeks ago, she spoke with the Iranian foreign minister and delivered that exact message, that any interaction with the Iranian authorities today will solely focus on making sure that Ms. Mombeini is able to return home. She has also raised that issue directly with the Iranian permanent representative to the United Nations.

Let me say this. I strongly doubt that any foreign minister of a previous government would have been able to fight for a Canadian citizen as we have been able to do. We understand the commitment we have made to the citizens of Canada. It is a promise to provide the help and assistance that we are able to do. At every opportunity, we raise consular issues with other countries, including with Iran.

It is appalling to us that Saeed Malekpour remains in prison in Iran. In fact, just under a week ago, Mr. Malekpour marked the 10th birthday that he has spent in an Iranian prison. We advocate for his case at every opportunity. Our government is in frequent contact with Mr. Malekpour's family, and I have spoken with his sister, Maryam, whose bravery and determination I truly commend.

Our government's commitment to Canadians oversees is paramount. The case of Dr. Homa Hoodfar, who in 2016 was released from a Tehran prison after 112 days of detention, illustrates this. Our Government of Canada was actively engaged at the highest levels in Dr. Hoodfar's case, working for her release. The decision of the Conservative government to shutter our embassy in Iran, of course, made providing this help and advocating for Dr. Hoodfar's release even more significant a challenge. In the absence of diplomatic representation of its own in Iran, Canada worked closely with other countries, notably Oman, Italy, and Switzerland, in helping secure Dr. Hoodfar's release. We were extremely relieved and pleased to be able to welcome Dr. Hoodfar back to Canada.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the many people who worked so hard on this case, including of course, our own Canadian diplomats.

It is clear that the lack of respect for human rights in Iran is a serious concern for our government, and for all Canadians. The promotion and protection of human rights are at the core of our foreign policy, and we raise these issues globally, both bilaterally and in international forums. That is why Canada leads the annual United Nations General Assembly resolution on the situation of human rights in Iran. This was begun in 2003, and we welcomed the adoption of the Canadian-led resolution by the General Assembly again last year in 2017.

Our concerns with Iran include the highest number of executions, particularly of juveniles, widespread discrimination against women and girls, restrictions on freedom of expression, and serious and systematic discrimination and harassment of ethnic and religious minorities. The UN resolution sends a strong message to Iranians that the international community remains concerned about persistent human rights violations in Iran. Our government also meets with human rights groups on the human rights situation in Iran regularly. This includes organizations such as Amnesty International, as well as Iranian minorities such as the Baha'i community.

● (1245)

I have met on several occasions with groups of Iranian-Canadians to discuss human rights issues, including the cases of individuals detained in Iran. This includes the Mohammad Ali Taheri human rights campaign. We are concerned by the case of Mr. Mohammad Taheri, who has been in prison in Iran for a few years.

I commend those who continue to advocate for human rights. We must never be afraid to fight and stand up for human rights. At the very core of our government's foreign policy is the protection and promotion of human rights. It is a fundamental belief of our government and a reflection of Canadian values that human rights and democratic rights should not be denied to any person, and that no government should seek to do so. We are not afraid to speak up when these rights are denied.

At the end of December last year and at the beginning of January, the Iranian people exercised their right to protest. These protests were widespread, taking place in some 80 cities throughout Iran. They attracted a broad cross-section of society, and protestors expressed their discontent on a number of issues. These protests were the demonstration of genuine frustration and real grievances. On December 30, our government was one of the first around the world to speak out publicly in support of the Iranian people. As we said then, we were encouraged by the Iranian people who were exercising their basic right to protest peacefully. We also called on the Iranian authorities to uphold and respect democratic and human rights.

However, the Iranian security services arrested approximately 3,700 protestors. At least 25 were killed. In addition to this tragic outcome, security services also attempted to suppress the protests by blocking access to social media. On January 3, the Minister of Foreign Affairs issued another statement on the protests, expressing how deeply troubled Canada was by the deaths and detention of protestors in Iran. We reiterated that the Iranian people have the right to freely assemble and express themselves without facing violence or imprisonment, and called on the Iranian authorities to uphold and respect democratic and human rights, which are too often ignored.

We also remain deeply concerned by Iran's support of terrorism. That is why Canada has listed Iran as a supporter of terrorism under the State Immunity Act. Also, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force is listed as a terrorist entity under the Criminal Code, and the IRGC is listed under the Special Economic Measures Act. This means that all persons in Canada are prohibited from engaging in certain activities with the IRGC and the IRGC Quds Force, such as dealing with its properties or entering into a financial transaction. These are strong and meaningful sanctions on Iran, reflective of its actions, internal and external, and they will continue to remain in place.

Let me also be clear on a further point. We also absolutely and without equivocation condemn Iran's actions against Israel. We condemn the recent abhorrent statement by the supreme leader Khamenei that clearly incited hate and violence. As the Minister of Foreign Affairs said then, we are appalled by it. We strongly condemn its incitement to violence as we condemn all of Iran's threats against Israel. Canadians want us to stand up for Iranian citizens who are tired of corruption, incompetency, and military adventurism that directs precious resources to questionable endeavours and creates international instability rather than policies that could improve people's lives. These Iranian citizens are driven to the streets to protest, only to be met by violence from their own government.

Canadians expect us to have the promotion and protection of human rights at the core of our foreign policy. They also expect us to raise the consular cases of Canadians abroad. We understand that, and that is why our government is so committed to doing it. Let me repeat our firm position on the decision by Iranian authorities to deny Ms. Mombeini the ability to leave Iran. Until that decision is reversed, and until Ms. Mombeini has the freedom to return home to Canada, the focus of any discussion with Iran will be on securing that freedom. We will continue to call on the Iranian authorities to give answers to the detention and death of Kavous Seyed-Emami. We also call on the Iranian authorities to release Saeed Malekpour.

● (1250)

What our government values above all are the lives and well-being of Canadian citizens. That has always been and will always be our absolute focus.

In closing, let me add one more thought. Canadians are not deceived by the Conservatives' rhetoric. The Conservatives were in power for 10 years and Canadians saw they were not able to make any progress. On our core values, we agree with all the messages and virtue signalling they keep promoting today. However, we disagree with them on the fact that Canada needs to be impolite. The hon. member just said that we need to be impolite to achieve those goals.

As the Prime Minister said last weekend, Canadians are polite and reasonable people, but Canadians will not be pushed around. Canada will not be pushed around. Canada will stand up for Canadian citizens abroad and for human rights everywhere, and we will find the best way to achieve those objectives.

I want to close by saying that I find it regrettable that the hon. members on the opposite side are using consular cases for partisan purposes when Canadians' lives are at stake. I accept the fact that they have the right and, in fact, I welcome their tough questions on the government's approach to dealing with these cases, but to politicize consular cases for partisan reasons is unbecoming of the official opposition.

Canadians are not deceived by this because they have not forgotten the 10 years under the Harper government when the Conservatives were not able to accomplish anything. In fact, they remember cases of Canadian citizens abroad who were abandoned, ignored, and neglected.

I welcome the voices of opposition members on this debate, but I call upon them to be prudent, to be wise, and to be careful when using consular cases for partisan purposes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is quite striking how in literally the same sentence he attacks the previous government for our alleged record on consular cases and then also says that consular issues should be above partisan attacks. The member surely cannot have it both ways.

As well, he did misquote me, by the way. I appreciate that he was listening but I suggest he listen to my remarks more carefully. It might provide more opportunities for a deeper understanding of the Conservative world view. In particular, what I said was not that we ought to be impolite, rather it was that we should be "willing to be impolite" in defence of our values. A willingness to be impolite is something that is completely different, and obviously the member knows that.

This member and I have had many discussions, back and forth, about the government's approach to Iran, and I have challenged him on various aspects of it. However, I want to ask him a factual question. What is the government doing with respect to diplomatic relations with Iran? Is it presently pursuing the reopening of diplomatic relations? If it is, then we should know it and be able to discuss it. If it is not, then one wonders why it has such a disagreement with our policy, which was to close the embassy in the first place.

● (1255)

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Mr. Speaker, let me explain the difference. My colleague wanted to talk about why we are contrasting our record on consular cases at the same time as we are saying to avoid making personal consular cases a partisan matter. The hon. member is making the individual cases of Canadian citizens a partisan issue. If he wants to argue about our record of consular and their record of consular, I am happy to debate it and to make it a partisan issue. However, to personalize individual consular cases for the sake of partisanship is regrettable.

Let me answer his other question and be very clear. I do not know how much clearer I can be. As well, the Minister of Foreign Affairs has been incredibly clear on this. Today, our focus with any interaction with Iran is solely on making sure Ms. Mombeini is able to return back home.

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for underscoring the point that denouncing the Iranian regime cannot replace strong diplomacy.

To that end, I want to ask my colleague about the joint comprehensive plan of action, otherwise known as the Iran nuclear deal. Canada was very muted in its response when Trump pulled out of that deal. I would like to hear a bit more about why that may have been and about Canada's reaction, maybe expressing disappointment, to the United States.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: I disagree with my colleague, Mr. Speaker. She categorized our response as muted, but our response has been very clear and consistent. We expressed regret that the United States withdrew from that agreement. We have repeatedly said that the agreement has worked. It is imperfect, but it has worked. We will continue to work with our allies, with like-minded people, on making sure that Iran does not have nuclear weapons.

We thought the agreement had been working. We called on the U. S. to re-examine its decision. We regret that it withdrew. We will continue to work with our allies to achieve that goal.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as this is my first moment to take the floor this morning, I want to make it clear that I would have no trouble with this opposition motion if it was restricted to points (a), (b), (c)(ii), c(iii), and (d). As is often the case with opposition motions in this place, something that appears to be something we would all agree with generally has a poison pill in it somewhere so that the party putting it forward can divide the House. I wish we could have motions that unite us.

We do stand with the people of Iran. We do not condone the actions of the government of Iran. We condemn the human rights violations of the government of Iran. However, I think the parliamentary secretary had it right. We need to extend and rebuild the conversation, because cutting off Iran does not help anyone, and it does not help the people of Iran. The worst thing is what President Trump has just done by pulling out of an agreement that made the world safer.

I think back to Ambassador Ken Taylor. What would Canada have done if we had not had an embassy in Tehran? We could never have smuggled six Americans out of Iran if we had not been there.

● (1300)

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Mr. Speaker, my friend from Saanich—Gulf Islands has raised an important question. I want to agree with her on this. I feel that Canadians can see through these types of motions.

The Conservative Party's sole desire is not really to advance substantive, thoughtful policies. It is interested in playing partisan games on issues that are important and serious. While there are important issues to be debated and on which members will disagree, which is legitimate, the objective of this type of motion is only to inflame rhetoric and to exaggerate the fears Canadians have. We in the government and those in other parties have to look at the motion in its entirety and make our decision.

Let me be very clear. This motion has not been moved to focus on helping consular cases. It is meant to be used just for partisan purposes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, my friend across the way is against Conservatives and against partisanship. He is apparently against self-awareness, as well.

It sounded like we had an answer, almost. It sounded like my colleague was saying, in response to my earlier question, that the government is currently not in the process of seeking to reopen diplomatic relations, at least until the situation of Ms. Mombeini is resolved. Could the parliamentary secretary clarify that? Is the government presently seeking to reopen diplomatic relations with Iran? If it is not, then surely it has no reason not to support the motion.

There is one section of the motion that I understand is problematic for the Green Party and the NDP, but if the government is presently not seeking to reopen diplomatic relations, then it should be willing to support the motion.

Are we presently in the process of seeking to reopen diplomatic relations with Iran? Yes or no, please.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Mr. Speaker, we want to make sure that the Iranian authorities understand this very clearly. Any current or ongoing interaction with the Iranian authorities will solely focus on making sure that Ms. Mombeini comes back home. I cannot be any clearer for the hon. member. I also want to be very clear for the Iranian authorities. We cannot focus beyond the case of Ms. Mombeini. We want to see her come back home.

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question, but it is for the ambassador of Iran.

I would like to thank the parliamentary secretary for bringing up the Baha'is. In previous administrations in Iran, there was terrible treatment of the Baha'i people. I am sure this government would like to see freedom of religion and open religion in Iran. It would be great to have a comfort letter from the ambassador of Iran to me stating that Iran is open to religious freedom and that the Baha'is can practise their religion peacefully.

Mr. Omar Alghabra: Mr. Speaker, on the issue of minorities in Iran, including the Baha'is, I have frequently met with members of the Baha'i community here in Canada to hear directly from them about the situation in Iran, the treatment the Baha'is receive in Iran, and the lack of freedom of expression and freedom of religion. I have assured them that our government remains committed to defending their rights and defending the rights of the Baha'is in Iran. We will always push the Iranian regime to ensure that all Iranians, including minorities, including the Baha'is, have the ability to practise their faith, to assemble, and to be proud of their background and their faith without suppression or persecution.

● (1305)

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is overwhelming agreement among the parties here today, and I can attest to that with confidence because of my work as vice-chair of the Subcommittee on International Human Rights. I am proud of the work we have done on the subject of human rights in Iran. I also appreciate the collegiality that exists among the three parties represented on the subcommittee and how we focus on addressing human rights in Iran. We do this in a non-partisan fashion, because it is a non-partisan issue.

I am disappointed in today's opposition day motion, because it forsakes a real opportunity to fortify our consensus. Instead of bringing forward a motion on the matter of Iran that could be supported by all parties, and this would have been the simplest and easiest thing to write, my hon. colleagues in the official opposition have decided to play politics instead. If the party opposite truly cared about this issue, it would be reaching out and extending a hand to all the other parties so that a sense of unity of purpose could be established within this chamber, but no, our hyperpartisan colleagues cannot resist the sensation they can wring out of this. Instead of trying to work with everyone, they drafted a motion that they well know contains language the other parties cannot support.

While New Democrats agree with much of the motion being debated here today, particularly the support it expresses for Iranians and their fundamental human rights, we object to the call to "immediately cease any and all negotiations or discussions with the Islamic Republic of Iran to restore diplomatic relations".

People in my riding of Windsor—Tecumseh have been following the citizenship and immigration issues that come with diplomatic strains, and they are astute to what is going on here.

In April, CBC reported about the case of one of my constituents, Pooya Mirzabeygi, who had to wait more than 40 months for his permanent residency application to be finalized. He holds a master's degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Western Ontario, and he is currently working in research and development in the automotive industry.

I wanted to express that more pointedly for Canadians. For those out there today watching this debate, those who happen to care about the awful situation of human rights in Iran, please take note. The party opposite knows that we will not accept this language. It added it for the sole purpose of attempting to drive a wedge between us and Canadians. Conservatives care more about manipulating messages and scoring cheap political points against their opponents than they do about addressing the issue of human rights in Iran. This is unfortunate, given how much overwhelming agreement there is among the parties here today on the situation of Iran's human rights abuses and aggression.

Canadians and New Democrats stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of Iran in their aspirations for freedom, peace, democracy, and the rule of just law. We will continue to stand with them and speak out when their voices are unfairly silenced. We will unequivocally condemn comments by Iranian cleric Ayatollah Ahmad Khatami, who threatened cities in Israel, and comments by supreme leader Ali Khamenei regarding the destruction of Israel, as has been mentioned, including, most recently, when he said that "Israel is a malignant cancerous tumor...that has to be removed and eradicated". These comments are an unacceptable incitement to violence against an entire population.

We support the right of Israel to defend itself. We urge Canada to do everything in its power to avoid an escalation of conflict in the Middle East. New Democrats are deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Iran. We believe that Canada should continue to be firm in its dealings with Iran and push harder on human rights issues.

● (1310)

According to human rights organizations:

[Iranian] authorities heavily suppressed the rights to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly, as well as freedom of religion and belief, and imprisoned scores of individuals who voiced dissent. Trials are systematically unfair. Torture and other ill-treatment was widespread and committed with impunity. Floggings, amputations and other cruel punishments were carried out [as a matter of grim routine]. The authorities endorsed pervasive discrimination and violence based on gender, political opinion, religious belief, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation and gender identity. Hundreds of people were executed, some in public, and thousands remained on death row. They included people who were under the age of 18 at the time of the crime....

Among those targeted were peaceful political dissidents, journalists, online media workers, students, filmmakers, musicians and writers, as well as human rights defenders including women's rights activists, minority rights and environmental activists, trade unionists, anti-death penalty campaigners, lawyers, and those seeking truth, justice and reparation for the mass executions and enforced disappearances of the 1980s.

Many prisoners of conscience undertook hunger strikes to protest their unjust imprisonment.

Popular social media sites have been blocked.

Freedom of religion and belief was systematically violated in law and practice. The authorities continued to impose codes of public conduct rooted in a strict interpretation of Shi'a Islam on individuals of all faiths. Non-Shi'a Muslims were not allowed to stand as presidential candidates or hold key political offices.

Widespread and systemic attacks continued to be carried out against the Baha'i minority. These included arbitrary arrests, lengthy imprisonment, torture and other ill-treatment, forcible closure of Baha'i-owned businesses, confiscation of Baha'i properties, bans on employment in the public sector and denial of access to universities.

For Iranian authorities, the Baha'i have long played the role of first scapegoat of choice and are routinely blamed for everything from economic decline to Zionist spies.

As well, Kurdish people in Iran are targeted.

Iran's border guards continued to unlawfully shoot and kill, with full impunity, scores of unarmed Kurdish men known as Kulbars who work as cross-border porters between Iraqi and Iranian Kurdistan. In September, security forces violently suppressed protests in Baneh and Sanandaj over the fatal shootings of two Kulbars, and detained more than a dozen people.

There was a heavy police presence cross Kurdistan province in September when members of Iran's Kurdish minority held rallies in support of the independence referendum in the Kurdish region of northern Iraq. More than a dozen people were reportedly arrested....

Earlier in the year, judicial officials had exerted persistent pressure on the Ministry of Information and Communications Technology to request that Telegram relocate its servers to Iran and close tens of thousands of Telegram channels, which according to the judiciary "threatened national security" or "insulted religious values". Telegram said it rejected both requests.

● (1315)

Other popular social media sites including Facebook, Twitter and YouTube remained blocked.

Journalists and online media workers faced a renewed wave of harsh interrogations and arbitrary arrests and detentions before the presidential election in May. Those using Telegram were particularly targeted for harsh prison sentences, some exceeding a decade.

Freedom of musical expression remained curtailed. Women were banned from singing in public and the authorities continued to forcibly cancel many concerts. In August, several hundred artists called on President Rouhani to end such restrictions.

The authorities continued their violent raids on private mixed-gender parties, arresting hundreds of young people and sentencing many to flogging.

Censorship of all forms of media and jamming of foreign satellite television channels continued. The judicial authorities intensified their harassment of journalists working with the Persian BBC service, freezing the assets of 152 former or current BBC journalists and banning them from conducting financial transactions.

The Association of Journalists remained suspended.

Scores of students continued to be barred from higher education in reprisal for their peaceful activism, despite President Rouhani's election promise to lift the ban.

Bans on independent trade unions persisted and several trade unionists were unjustly imprisoned. Security forces continued to violently suppress peaceful protests by workers, including on International Workers' Day.

Dozens of environmental activists were summoned for interrogation, detained and prosecuted for participating in peaceful protests against air pollution, disappearing lakes, river diversion projects and dumping practices.

Opposition leader Mehdi Karroubi and Mir Hossein Mousavi and the latter's wife, Zahra Rahnavard, remained under house arrest without charge or trial since 2011....

Torture and other ill-treatment remained common, especially during interrogations. Detainees held by the Ministry of Intelligence and the Revolutionary Guards were routinely subjected to prolonged solitary confinement amounting to torture.

Failure to investigate allegations of torture and exclude "confessions" obtained under torture as evidence against suspects remained systematic.

The authorities continued to deprive prisoners detained for political reasons of adequate medical care. In many cases, this was done as a deliberate punishment or to extract "confessions", and it amounted to torture.

Prisoners endured cruel and inhuman conditions of detention, including overcrowding, limited hot water, inadequate food, insufficient beds, poor ventilation and insect infestations.

More than a dozen political prisoners at Karaj's Raja'i Shahr prison waged a prolonged hunger strike between July and September in protest at their dire detention conditions. Some faced denial of medical care, solitary confinement and fresh criminal charges in reprisal....

In February, the Supreme Court upheld a binding sentence issued by a criminal court in Kohgiluyeh and Boyer-Ahmad province against a woman in retribution for blinding another woman.

Dozens of amputation sentences were imposed and subsequently upheld by the Supreme Court. In April, judicial authorities in Shiraz, Fars province, amputated the hand of Hamid Moince and executed him 10 days later. He had been convicted of murder and robbery. At least four other amputation sentences were carried out for robbery....

In May, a woman arrested for having an intimate extramarital relationship was sentenced by a criminal court in the capital, Tehran, to two years of washing corpses and 74 lashes. The man was sentenced to 99 lashes....

Trials, including those resulting in death sentences, were systematically unfair. There were no independent mechanisms for ensuring accountability within the judiciary. Serious concerns remained that judges, particularly those presiding over Revolutionary Courts, were appointed on the basis of their political opinions and affiliation with intelligence bodies, and lacked legal qualifications.

● (1320)

This past December and January, protests began in reaction to the Iranian budget. Iranian people engaged in widespread protests calling for clerics to be reined in, an end to corruption, the end of support for Assad in Syria, and the end of the dictatorship. Iran has reportedly arrested nearly 5,000 people during recent protests, and at least 25 were killed. The majority of those arrested are educated young people. These protests are the country's biggest unrest in a decade. Human rights organizations such as Human Rights Watch have demanded that the deaths of protestors be investigated.

Many of the concerns of protestors are about the Iranian economy. Unemployment remains high for youth; inflation is soaring; real wages are stagnating; and housing remains expensive and unaffordable to many. Some 80% of all workers in Iran are in insecure, temporary contracts. In the recent budget, which prompted protests across the country, the clerics were given billions to pay for religious libraries, for religious foundations, and to lead Friday prayers. This was on top of the purported further billions allocated to finance the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. Since the protests, however, President Rouhani has announced some economic reforms.

We are also encouraged by the many Iranians, including many women, who are currently speaking out for their rights. The hijab protests were started by Masih Alinejad, the founder of My Stealthy Freedom, an online movement that opposes the dress code.

The hashtag #WhiteWednesdays quickly spread across social media, with women of all ages posting pictures of themselves wearing white as a symbol of protest. Dozens of women have been arrested in Tehran for removing their head scarves in public. Many women recorded their acts of defiance, waving their head scarves around in busy crowds.

The NDP urges the Canadian government to advocate for the human rights of all those in Iran whose inalienable rights have been infringed.

Across the country, talented Iranian nationals' permanent residence applications are stuck in our system. The government recently acknowledged that the problem exists but has taken no concrete action to fix it.

The NDP is calling on the government to finally put an end to these delays once and for all. The government needs to immediately review the current system, identify the cause of delays, revise the process to prevent further delays, and ensure that Iranian nationals are not subject to wait times that are astronomically higher than those for other applicants.

Coming back to the motion being debated today, one of the main reasons we believe it is important to maintain diplomatic ties with regimes we do not like is that it is crucial to have lines of communication open between our officials and the officials of other countries precisely for those times when we need to work for the release of one of our unjustly imprisoned nationals. How can Canada possibly defend our people when we have no one in the country to do it on our behalf, no one who knows the lay of the land, the right officials to approach, and so on?

At the present time, Canada maintains diplomatic ties with a number of regimes that quite obviously do not share our values. Canada does this for the very practical reasons I have mentioned. My friends in the Conservative Party can correct me if I am wrong, but I do not recall hearing them call for shutting down our embassies or consulates in the Philippines, China, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, or the Democratic Republic of the Congo. There is no shortage of unsavoury regimes in the world.

The NDP has communicated on multiple occasions the urgency and scope of the problems created by diplomatic tensions. I urge us, today, to understand the language that has been laid out before us with this motion and leverage the actual ways in which we can advance human rights in Iran.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question for my colleague.

Would she support closing our embassy in a country if the Government of Canada could not ensure or guarantee the safety of the diplomatic staff?

• (1325)

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, what is important for us is to understand is that Canada is a middle power and we could be leveraging that soft power with any country. With respect to the ways we can close down consulate offices or reopen them, we can use the art of diplomacy to advance human rights much further. It does not have to boil down to whether an office is open or closed. Sometimes I hear this as an excuse to not use the art of diplomacy.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. colleague as she laid out the obvious human rights abuses very deep within the Iranian regime. She also talked, though, about the role that Canada could play in the Middle East, and I want her to elaborate a little more.

One of the most surprising things I found with the former Harper government was when it decided to close the Iranian consulate. It made a political point and then left us completely outside of any credible conversation, especially at the time of the nuclear deal. The Harper government also abandoned the very large Iranian community in Canada, which should not have been demonized by that Conservative effort. It has done enormous work in building a better Canada. The Iranian community is involved in every aspect of our society and it deserves consular services.

Given her work, does hon. colleague have concerns about the Conservatives continually demonizing this issue and its effect on the Iranian-Canadian community that looks to us to defend its rights?

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague's question elicited a very emotional response in the House. That is reflective of the anger when we are emotional about things about which we care.

Canadians really are engaged and care about the human rights of their fellow citizens in Iran. They want to work with them when they do their silent protests to advance human rights and democracy in Iran. The problem I see is that when people care emotionally, they lash out with a kind of anger that is toxic. This does not help us advance human rights.

It takes incredible strength to put together the facts and find ways to engage the kinds of belligerent actors who does not see human rights the way we do, to the point where they have their own people protesting. It does not do us any good. It does not do us any good to have a toxic environment, instead of reaching out and engaging.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I was looking at this, we know Iran has supported and sponsored terrorism, and has violated human rights in its country. The hon. member presented that she does not agree with an emotional response to these actions. What is concrete action would she see us take to try and prevent Iran from continuing to sponsor terrorism and continuing to violate human rights in its country?

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague's question gives me an opportunity to clarify myself if I was misunderstood.

I believe that any thoughtful and meaningful response that is compassionate to the people of Iran, that advances their human rights is an emotional one. However, it is less out of anger and more out of well-being. That is what I wanted to clarify.

It takes incredible strength, as I said, to move forward and to engage.

I spent the better part of my speech describing the human rights situation in Iran and its abuses because I wanted to convey a full understanding of how horrendous the human right situation was for people in Iran and how incredibly brave my sisters were for doing their protest. It is an incredible environment.

I am thinking of some of the testimony we heard at the subcommittee for international human rights. We heard from retired Lieutenant-General Roméo Dallaire. He told us we needed to engage countries, not isolate them, if we wanted them to actually listen to us. We have to use our—

● (1330)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up very specifically on the question I asked the member earlier. I asked if she thought it would be reasonable to close an embassy in a case in which the security of Canadian diplomatic personnel could not be guaranteed. The member did not directly answer the question, but she said that sometimes we could still use diplomacy even if we did not have an embassy open. This is precisely our point. We can use back channels and find other ways of supporting Canadians in a country without upgrading our diplomatic relationship.

In light of that, I would again ask this question. Does the member think it is legitimate to close an embassy if there is a security question there?

Also, given what she said, is it not a basis for supporting the motion, saying, yes, we can have some dialogue and diplomacy outside of the framework of established diplomatic relations?

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, I listened earlier with interest as the member chastised someone else for not listening to his speech and for maybe not understanding.

The issue is not black and white. If a government needs to close an office for safety, of course it can. It can also reopen it. What is the time frame? I do not know. Is that part of the debate here? That is all so hypothetical.

We need diplomatic efforts to engage. I am not against engaging in diplomatic efforts and I am not against keeping people safe. To simplify the argument such that we have an "us" and "them" mentality, instead of actually creating consensus on how we can address, in the international community, the horrendous ongoing human rights abuses is really quite disappointing and frustrating for someone like me who understands the limited time we have in this place for debate about international human rights.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I really did appreciate my hon. friend's reflections on the good work being done in the human rights subcommittee.

This is a very key point. I want to know if she would amplify on the conditions with which one would ever want to close an embassy, given the diplomatic benefit to having a presence on the ground when fighting for human rights.

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle: Mr. Speaker, we have so many knowledgeable people who have established relationships in troublesome places, in troublesome countries. When there are heated moments or there is a threat of escalating conflict, there is no denying we need to have safety. However, there is much in place that we have to gain back. Once we close an office, we sever very valuable ties that could be used in the future. It is invaluable.

I suspect that this motion is meant to be toxic so we talk about these things and highlight these wedge issues.

What it boils down to is that we need our diplomatic ties and our offices in every place where there is human rights abuse in order to support people and engage these countries. These sovereign nations will not care what we think if they do not have a relationship with us. How are we ever supposed to advance human rights with countries that do not have a relationship with us? What do they care what we think?

That is the trick, that is the art of diplomacy. We need to have some kind of a presence in these countries. There are a lot of different ways we can do that through consulate offices. They do not have to be done in a cookie-cutter fashion.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join this opposition day motion debate on an important subject. I have long described Iran as the most destabilizing force in the world right now, standing in the way of global peace and security. We are talking about that today in bringing the debate to the floor of the House of Commons.

I would like to thank my colleague and the deputy shadow minister of foreign affairs, the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, for helping advance the debate today, and for being an active participant in it.

I have been following the debate, and I am amused by the fact that the Liberal parliamentary secretary and even some opposition members on this side of the House keep using the word "partisan". The government often throws this out, saying "stop being so partisan", as if in the chamber, which is designed for opposing points of view, debate, speech, and challenging the government, we are being partisan somehow if we suggest parts of the debate should focus on the horrendous and tyrannical regime in Iran. There is nothing partisan in that. In fact, it is an absence of leadership, of how quiet the Prime Minister has been vis à vis Iran.

The Liberals were being partisan when they formed government and kept using the rhetoric "Canada is back". Back to what, when it comes to Iran? Back to being silent in the face of the death of a Canadian, to being silent in the face of thousands being imprisoned? In February, Alex Neve of Amnesty International that confirmed thousands had been detained without charges in Iran.

The Prime Minister was one of the few global leaders absolutely silent with respect to the protests in Iran, the democratic desire for a people to have human rights, a basic level of democratic rights and freedoms that we take for granted. The Prime Minister, who loves traversing the world as the global progressive, has been very silent with respect to Iran. That is why we are here today. If those members want to suggest we are partisan, well thank goodness we are partisan. One of the Liberals' own members, the member for Richmond Hill, has been an apologist for the regime, and has hosted delegations from Iran in Canada. Perhaps that is why the Prime Minister does not want to talk much about it. Maybe there is some debate in his caucus on how much we should engage in Iran, or how much we should call out its behaviour.

Mr. Speaker, I got into a rhetorical flight so quickly that I forgot to mention I would be dividing my time with my friend from Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis.

The first time the Prime Minister mentioned Iran in the House of Commons was in January 2016. He said, "We know that Iran is a cause for concern". Later on he said that global safety would be through "responsible engagement"; "a cause for concern." Nothing better illustrates the fact the Prime Minister has either been willfully blind with respect to the horrific conditions facing a lot of people in Iran or the fact he has been wanting to expand Canadian presence and negotiate aircraft sales, and this shows that the Liberal government has had the wrong approach when it comes to Iran. This debate is about that.

When a regime is probably the most disruptive force to global peace and security, we have to be careful that our engagement with it is not normalizing that regime. Comments suggesting there is an elected government in Iran, as if the protests were just regular protests for tuition fees or something and they should negotiate with their elected officials, is irresponsible. The Prime Minister should condemn statements from his own caucus that will allow some Canadians to not have the proper view of a regime that is the most oppressive on earth.

We have seen this even more in recent months. The death of Professor Seyed-Emami, a Canadian citizen in Evin prison, has eerie reminiscence of the death of photojournalist Zahra Kazemi in the same prison. Now it appears that Maryam Mombeini, who went to try to investigate the circumstances of her husband's death, who was illegally detained alongside thousands in Iran, cannot return home. This is the type of regime with which we are dealing.

● (1335)

In the same time, over the last 30 years or since the revolution of 1979, there has been an express desire for nuclearization of an Iranian regime, which would be a direct threat not only to Israel but to global security in the Middle East and around the world.

This motion also highlights the horrific role that the Islamic revolutionary guard plays, with respect to oppressing its own people not just in Iran but around the world. It has been a direct funder and supporter of terror in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Afghanistan, Gaza, and Palestinian-controlled territories, funding Hamas, funding terror, and not wanting peace, security, and stability. Therefore, I would think that condemning that should be something all members of this House would do.

We are here today because of the general silence with respect to the current government's position on Iran. It seems that, after we pushed it, it is holding off on the aircraft sale. That is a refreshing development from us pushing the government on that. Boeing has said it will not sell any type of aircraft to the regime, at a time when more global attention is being paid to Iran, as it should be, because the international community has to condemn the actions of the regime. Just last week, the supreme leader called for genocide on the Jewish people. The Iranians have tried to normalize their positions of hate. We have to be very careful that in this rush, as the Prime Minister naively said in his first few months as the Prime Minister, of responsible engagement with the Iranian regime, we are not somehow normalizing that regime.

I would point my friend the parliamentary secretary, who is listening to this debate, to the comments made in April by Madam Shirin Ebadi, who is a Nobel Peace Prize winner for her work as a human rights lawyer. She is an Iranian woman who is championing the cause of freedom and democratic rights. In an interview in April she told *Bloomberg*, "Reform is useless in Iran." She went on to say, "The Iranian people are very dissatisfied with their current government. They have reached the point and realized this system is not reformable." Therefore, a number of the elements we are bringing to this debate are to showcase that, and to demand that the Liberal government start speaking up for the people of Iran and the families impacted, like Ms. Mombeini. It should be speaking up for the very principles that it talked about at Charlevoix. That seems to be absent when it comes to Iran.

We would also like the Liberals to correct the record, which was made fuzzy in January of this year by their own member for Richmond Hill, at a time when the Prime Minister was silent, and there was no clear direction from our foreign affairs minister. That single tweet by a Liberal member of Parliament sent a very bad signal. At a bare minimum, it was incredibly naive, or possibly worse. Therefore, I would like to see the government clearly renounce that view and not allow that member to host Iranian delegations in Canada.

What else would I like to see out of this opposition day motion now that we are shining the bright light of accountability on a government that does not like it? I would like to see the government apply Magnitsky sanctions against the supreme leader and many of the key regime functionaries who promote hate and support terrorism. The Magnitsky sanctions should be applied immediately.

I would like to see Iran put on the country control list. We have debated arms trade in this place. The Liberals seem to forget that they have the ability to stop all sales with regimes like Iran. Only North Korea is currently on that list. Iran should be immediately placed on country control list.

I would like to see Iran removed from the SWIFT financial system. We have seen it directly fund terror operations around the world, putting people at risk, and in some cases using money from the Iranian deal previously negotiated. Access to the SWIFT system has allowed this to be moved.

I would like a clear statement from the Prime Minister. Even if the Liberals support this motion today, I would like the Prime Minister to be clear in his renunciation of the regime, and to sanction the member for Richmond Hill for clouding the issue with respect to whether Iranians truly get to elect their government.

● (1345)

Mr. Omar Alghabra (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Consular Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians can see through the selective retelling of history by this member. He brought up Amnesty International, and I am glad he did because Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and other independent, credible human rights organizations have spoken clearly about our government's record in speaking out for human rights around the world. These non-partisan organizations have spoken about the contrast between our approach and our voice on human rights compared to the other government.

I agree with the member that there is room for partisanship in this place on policy, and I agree with him that we need to have a strong debate on these issues. Does he not regret naming individual Canadians who are in harm's way and making them a partisanship issue?

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, I did find it ironic that the parliamentary secretary is suggesting our motion, and by extension my speech, is a selective retelling of history. That is what he said. I began my speech talking about the Prime Minister of Canada, his prime minister, and the first comments he made in this chamber on Iran, which were that "Iran is a cause for concern". That certainly showed a real concern about regime when he said that it was a cause for concern.

This debate is about putting in the public sphere a full debate on what Canada should be doing. I ended my speech with a number of things I think we should be doing. With regard to regret for naming people, we are hearing from Iranian Canadians, the Persian community in Toronto, who have been in touch with us. I met with them weeks ago, and they are concerned for their families. We have heard that from some of the debates in this House. They are concerned for Ms. Mombeini.

To suggest reports in the newspaper that highlight the death of Professor Seyed-Emami and the tragic case of his wife being detained is something we should not talk about, no, Canadians need to know that their parliamentarians are pushing for Canadians to be respected. The fact that Evin prison, from Zahra Kazemi to Professor Seyed-Emami, is a place where our own citizens have been tortured, and in the case of Zahra Kazemi, raped, we should not be silent but we should be shouting this from the mountaintops. I have said that we need to hold Iran to account.

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to state in this House I am supportive of my colleague from Windsor—Tecumseh's comments that emphasize the importance of using diplomacy and building relationships on the ground as a way to move forward and support people living within regimes and nations where their human rights are not being respected. I feel many Iranian Canadians trying to get permanent residency here in Canada are concerned that part of that delay is that there is not an embassy in Iran.

What is the proof that going a different route would have more impact on restoring human rights for people in Iran, that is, closing an embassy rather than opening an embassy and keeping diplomatic relations going?

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member. She mentioned the speech by her colleague from Windsor—Tecumseh highlighting some of the amazing work done by human rights advocates, by protesters on the ground. The Prime Minister's silence in the face of thousands of people protesting, thousands illegally detained, does not send the right signal.

There are two things with regard to the question she has raised about engagement and the embassy. When we cannot guarantee the safety of our own personnel from Global Affairs, we should be very hesitant. People have mentioned Ken Taylor. I had the opportunity several times to have lunch with Ken Taylor while he was still alive. He was known for the "Canadian caper", where we had to hide American diplomats in Iran, so actually there is a track record of diplomats being targeted in that country. That is the first thing.

The second is perhaps just as important. The more we normalize relations with what I would suggest is a tyrannical regime, the more we are playing into their propaganda war. By selling aircraft and having the MP for Richmond Hill hosting delegations, we are treating them like they are a friend. We have to isolate them. That is what all freedom-loving countries should do: isolate, call out that conduct. It is not just Iran. I have listed the countries where it has been proven they are funding terror. This regime, over time, has to go. When there are people on the ground spontaneously pledging for that, Canada should not be silent. We should show we have solidarity with them.

● (1350)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this motion and encourage my colleagues to do the same, especially after the excellent statement by my colleague and friend from Ontario on the importance of having every member of Parliament support this motion.

I will deliver my presentation in three parts. First, I will address the aspects of the motion. Second, I will explain why it is important to raise public awareness in Canada about what is happening in Iran. Third, I will give a concrete example that illustrates that what happens there has repercussions here.

The motion moved today seeks to strongly condemn the current regime in Iran for its ongoing sponsorship of terrorism around the world, including instigating violent attacks on the Gaza border. We recently saw to what extent Iran fuels tensions in several countries instead of easing them and avoiding violent clashes. Instead of looking for peaceful resolutions, Iran tries to create conflicts.

The motion also condemns recent statements made by Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei calling for genocide against the Jewish people. Canada cannot tolerate that. Conflicts like this must be resolved peacefully and respectfully. We cannot sanction a country that calls for genocide, particularly against the Jewish people. God knows the Jews have seen their share of suffering throughout history.

The motion also calls for Iran to abandon its current plan and immediately cease its nuclear weapons development program. We are also asking our government to abandon its soft approach and its current plan and to immediately cease any and all negotiations or discussions with the Islamic Republic of Iran to restore diplomatic relations. Our government must demand that the Iranian regime immediately release all Canadians and Canadian permanent residents who are currently detained in Iran, including Maryam Mombeini. She is a Canadian citizen, and we want her back. It is important to state her name in both French and English and to demand that the government bring back the people who went over there. Maryam is the widow of Professor Kavous Sayed-Emami. Nor must we forget Saeed Malekpour, who has been imprisoned since 2008. It is now 2018.

Furthermore, the motion urges the government to immediately designate the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a listed terrorist entity under the Criminal Code of Canada, and to stand with the people of Iran and recognize that they, like all people, have a fundamental right to freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of thought, belief, opinion, and expression, including freedom of the press and other forms of communication, freedom of peaceful assembly, and freedom of association.

If we truly want to promote the fundamental rights that our country is built on, we also need to be vigilant and speak out when heads of state behave like tyrants. Iran is one such example. The Iranian government acts very harshly toward its people, and the Liberal must not look away from these situations. They must speak out. Right now, it seems like the Liberals want to downplay the relationship with Iran, but that would be tantamount to condoning the hateful statements in question, which are diametrically opposed to Canadian principles and rights.

Everyone on this side of the House, and probably every MP, recognizes that Iran's brutal regime is a threat to global peace and safety. As we have seen over the past few months, Ali Khamenei's oppressive regime has turned on its own citizens and continues to sponsor terrorism abroad. It is especially obsessed with destroying Israel, a democratic country in the Middle East, which is totally unacceptable.

● (1355)

This is why we must never hesitate to denounce the Iranian regime and take action against it, given its support for terrorism, its Holocaust denial, and its repeated threats toward Israel.

The government likes to say that it must be a strong voice for freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. This is great for Canada, but it would also be great for the people of Iran. At present, however, the Liberal government says nothing and will not lift a finger when the time comes to defend the rights and freedoms of Iranians. The problem here is that if Canada does not play this role and does not defend those values, they will be threatened right here at home. That is why we are concerned about this government's complacency regarding a brutal regime that has such contempt for its own people.

An activity funded by Iran, a hateful demonstration calling for the eradication of the Israeli people, no less, was held yesterday not in the streets in Tehran, but in Toronto. This happened right here at home, in our streets, on the grounds of the Ontario legislature, where a new government was just democratically elected. How can such incitements to violence be tolerated?

That is why every parliamentarian has the responsibility and moral obligation to condemn violence and hate speech. That is why it is important to support not just the motion itself, but also the spirit of the motion.

For example, the spiritual leader Shafiq Huda called for the eradication of the Israeli people, in clear violation of the Criminal Code. There are sanctions and a complaint was filed with the police. Unfortunately, we learned that one of the organizations that was part of this rally received funding from the current government under the Canada summer jobs program.

Members will recall that the government introduced an attestation to ensure that organizations that receive taxpayers' money respect the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Now, the leader of one such organization is promoting hate in the streets of Toronto.

The government needs to wake up; it has the opportunity to do so by supporting the motion before the House today.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis will have two minutes for his speech and five minutes for questions and answers when the House resumes debate on this motion.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bécancour—Nicolet—Saurel, QD): Mr. Speaker, the only thing rising faster than gas prices in Quebec is the blood pressure of consumers, who are being forced to pay abnormally high retail markups. That is not without consequences.

A survey showed that one in three Quebeckers are reconsidering their summer vacation plans because of gas prices. That is bad news for families, and even worse news for remote regions like the Gaspé, whose economies depend on summer tourism.

We asked the Minister of Innovation to order the Competition Bureau to look into the possibility of a gas cartel, but he did not respond. Even the Government of Quebec asked him whether he was going to take steps to ensure that the gasoline market is fair and equitable, but again he did not respond.

With the price of gas as high as it is, only a Liberal minister would allow himself the luxury of falling asleep at the wheel.

● (1400)

[*English*]

HUMBER RIVER—BLACK CREEK

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, community is not a location; it is a feeling, a feeling of acceptance, reliance, and trust. I am thankful for the many individuals who have contributed to my riding's sense of community, but today I want to specifically reference the Totera family.

Tony Totera is an Italian immigrant who spent his childhood mastering the inner workings of Italian cuisine. In 1972, he and his family brought this taste to the neighbourhood of Jane and Finch, and has since then been a trusted provider to our community's great restaurants and hotels.

For 40 years, Eddystone Meats has been a place in which customers can trust, but more than that, the Totera family has been a group in whom our whole community could trust. Their commitment to the riding is inspiring, with a true heart for helping the community through fundraising and volunteer work.

I want to thank them for their 40 years of kind service to my riding, and to all of Canada. Congratulations.

* * *

FATHER'S DAY

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Sunday is Father's Day, and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to and honour fathers across Canada. Fatherhood is a challenging, beautiful, and immensely important vocation. Fathers contribute immeasurably to the strength of their families and to the success of our communities.

My life has been informed by amazing examples of dedicated fatherhood. My father, Ernie Anderson, continues to be a voice of wisdom and encouragement in my life, and likes to remind me that he is my biggest fan. His example of integrity and hard work has been, and continues to be, a constant inspiration.

My husband Milton has been another source of inspiration. His unfailing love and dedication has provided me and our children and grandchildren with constant support, and created a space for us all to flourish.

I hope Canadians across the country will join me this Sunday in showing their appreciation to the fathers who have helped shape their lives.

* * *

BILL DAVIS

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after a bitter and protracted strike between the United Mine Workers of America and the British Empire Steel and Coal Company, harsh actions by the company brought the situation to a head.

On this day in 1925, striking coal miners marched to the company's power facility at New Waterford Lake, Cape Breton, in an attempt to have their power and water restored to their town after the company had shut it off. In the crowd of 3,000 was William Davis. Upon arrival, they were met by company police. Tensions rose, and the police fired 300 rounds into the crowd, injuring many, and killing Bill Davis. In the weeks following, company stores were looted and property vandalized. To quell the riots, 2,000 troops were brought in. This remains the second-largest deployment of troops for a domestic conflict in Canadian history, after the North-West Rebellion.

Today, in mining communities across Nova Scotia, people gather to pay tribute to Bill Davis, whose death stands as a symbol of the determination and resilience of Canadian coal miners, and to recognize the sacrifices made by organized labour in building this great country.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we will soon rise for the summer recess. There is much to do before then, but I would like to take this moment to highlight the exceptional work of certain individuals in my community who have contributed much to the debates in this place on matters of national interest.

Over the last four months, the justice and human rights committee has studied the scourge of human trafficking. Let it be clear: human trafficking is a horrible crime, robbing individuals of their basic human rights. I listened to the shocking testimony of survivors, who told us that some communities are particularly vulnerable to exploitation, such as indigenous women and girls and migrant communities.

I would like to thank especially Professor Cecilia Benoit of the University of Victoria, and Rachel Phillips and Sadie Forbes of Peers Victoria Resources Centre, who contributed so much to the justice committee study. Their thoughtful testimony will help us to build better legislation.

As we prepare to go home for the summer, let us recommit to building a better country, where no one is left behind.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.):

Niwakoma cuntik Tansai Nemcaytane Awapantitok.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian residential school system was a systematic plan to remove indigenous children from their homes, families, and cultures to facilitate in the stated policy of killing the Indian in the child. When Prime Minister Harper apologized here in the House on behalf of all Canadians 10 years ago, it represented an essential step on the path toward healing and reconciliation. Now, on the 10th anniversary of that apology, our government is translating those poignant words into eight indigenous languages. We have also followed through on the spirit of that apology with concrete action, both renewing the relationship on a foundation of implementation of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership, and with historic investments in the priorities of indigenous communities.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission's 94 calls to action now provide all Canadians with a renewed path forward on this shared journey of reconciliation. We must all commit to working together to heal those past wrongs.

Tapwe akwa khitwam hi hi.

* * *

● (1405)

FATHER'S DAY

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Sunday is Father's Day. We celebrate fathers and grandfathers by reminding them of their importance in each of our lives. I loved my father and father-in-law. Both were incredible men of God, who lived their faith with integrity and commitment. They loved their families and were role models for good. I am now the role model for my children and grandchildren. I also want to be a man who loves God and his family.

Men's health is also important, and I want to thank Dr. Larry Goldenberg and the Canadian Men's Health Foundation. They are working to raise awareness of preventable health problems. One big health problem for men is prostate cancer. I am a prostate cancer survivor, thanks to answered prayers, and Dr. Larry Goldenberg, one of the best urologists in the world.

I urge men to get their prostate checked every year, and also to check their blood PSA level. Those checkups can save their lives. I wish men a happy Father's Day.

* * *

CANADIAN MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mr. Randeep Sarai (Surrey Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as it is Father's Day this week, it is also Canadian Men's Health Week and the Don't Change Much campaign.

As parliamentarians, we work long hours and are constantly travelling back and forth to our constituencies. Therefore, it is very important that we take care of our physical and mental health. Many people look up to us as role models, and it is important that we take care of our health and promote a healthy lifestyle so others do the same.

It does not take much. Last week, I had the privilege of hosting the Canadian Men's Health Foundation's men's health caucus breakfast. I would like to thank the Canadian Men's Health Foundation president, Wayne Hartrick, for raising awareness on this vital issue. It was inspiring to hear from two former CFL players, British Columbians, Tommy Europe and Shea Emry, on how important it is to be healthy and active. Through simple changes, such as 30 minutes of daily activity or sleeping for seven hours, we can improve our life expectancy by up to 70%.

I want to commend Dr. Larry Goldenberg, a pioneer of prostate cancer and research, for his commitment to treating prostate cancer and other diseases, and preventing them from affecting men at an earlier age. Enjoy a happy—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge Park.

RAMADAN

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Scarborough—Rouge Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark Ramadan, the holy month of fasting and revelation for those of the Muslim faith. In my community, I had the opportunity to join my Muslim brothers and sisters at Jumma and Iftar at the Islamic Institute of Toronto, Usman Gousi Masjid, Masjid Al Jannah, and Masjid Zakariya.

Leading up to Ramadan, I had the pleasure to attend several fundraisers that demonstrated the generosity of the Muslim Canadian community. This year, the Muslim Welfare Centre celebrates 25 years of service to humanity. Some of its key projects include Project Ramadan and the Inuvik Food Bank in the Northwest Territories.

I want to commend the Muslim Welfare Centre, and Islamic Relief and others for their generosity and service to making our world a better place. As we celebrate Eid al-Fitr this week, let us recommit to ensuring that we not only celebrate our diverse Muslim communities in Canada, but also build a country and a world where all our children can live in peace, security, and harmony.

Eid Mubarak.

* * *

NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR WEEK

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to recognize National Blood Donor Week, especially significant this year because it is the 10th anniversary. The National Blood Donor Week Act was enacted by the Parliament of Canada in 2008 under the previous Conservative government.

I want to thank the thousands of Canadian blood donors who are the lifeblood of their communities. We cerebrate every donor, volunteer, and supporters during National Blood Donor Week. People who donate their blood know they are participating in an incredible act of service that can have such a big impact. This year alone, over 100,000 new donors are required across Canada to help with blood transfusions. All Canadians will either need blood themselves or know someone who will.

I encourage all Canadians to take the time to celebrate and to thank a blood donor during National Blood Donor Week. I urge all members and Canadians who are able to give life by donating blood to do so, and remember that, it is in us to give.

● (1410)

[*Translation*]

HAROLD THOMAS HERBERT

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of a long line of members for Vaudreuil—Soulanges who helped build our community. Today, I would like to draw attention to the contribution of Harold Thomas Herbert. A member of the British air force and a Spitfire pilot during the Second World War, Hal built his life in our historic town of Hudson, where he is well known for his community service and his contribution to the development of Manoir Cavagnal.

[*English*]

It is his work as a member of Parliament under Pierre Trudeau that we have all benefited from. Hal made history on July 9, 1982, when his bill passed the House of Commons renaming July 1 "Canada Day", which was used and celebrated for the first time on July 1, 1983.

Thirty-five years later, and on behalf of the entire House, I want to thank his wife Madelaine Herbert and grandson Matthew, who join me in Ottawa today, and posthumously express my thanks to Hal for giving us a day that we all celebrate on July 1: Canada Day.

[*Translation*]

Happy Canada Day.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA-UKRAINE FRIENDSHIP GROUP

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I join all members in welcoming to Canada a delegation of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, led by First Vice-Speaker Iryna Gerashchenko and the co-chair of the Ukraine-Canada parliamentary friendship group Ivan Krulko.

The delegation is here to advance the special and strategic relationship between Canada and Ukraine, based on historic bonds that extend over 125 years and rooted in the 1.4 million strong Ukrainian Canadian community.

Building upon the unanimously passed Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement and the Canada-Ukraine defence co-operation arrangement, as well as the military assistance provided through Operation Unifier, jointly we will be discussing Ukraine's security, human and economic development, and its Euro-Atlantic integration.

To our Verkhovna Rada friends, Canada's Parliament stands shoulder to shoulder with Ukraine during this time of Russian military aggression and occupation.

Slava Ukraini. Slava Kanadi.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SECURITY

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the G7 summit having now come to a close, on behalf of myself and the people of Quebec City, I want to congratulate the Integrated Security Unit partners: the RCMP, the Sûreté du Québec, the Service de police de la Ville de Québec, and especially chief Robert Pigeon.

A deployment of such magnitude requires a huge amount of preparation. When events like these are over, some people feel as though there was too much police presence, but we have to be prepared, because there is no room for error when it comes to protecting the public. We should be proud of keeping our city pristine, and more importantly, of ensuring that our many business owners did not have to worry about submitting claims to be reimbursed for property damage. Mr. Pigeon and the Service de police de la Ville de Québec have all my respect for planning out every detail with such professionalism, and for allowing controlled demonstrations in a healthy and respectful democracy.

We must never forget that upholding democracy means upholding both my freedom and my neighbour's freedom.

* * *

[*English*]

FILIPINO HERITAGE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.):

[*Member spoke in Tagalog*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, the Filipino heritage community is going to be hitting one million people in the next two to three years. Canada's Filipino heritage community is enriching every aspect of our society, whether it is our culture or our economy, as we see that community continue to grow and prosper.

This week we are going to be celebrating 120 years of Philippine independence. Every region of our country is going to be celebrating Filipino heritage in terms of recognizing what the Philippines has done for Canada.

Going beyond immigration, we need to look at ways in which we can expand issues such as trade, tourism, and so much more.

It does not matter where one goes in Canada: Winnipeg, Vancouver, Toronto, or Edmonton. In every region, we are celebrating Filipino heritage, Canada-style.

* * *

● (1415)

NATIONAL DAY OF HEALING AND RECONCILIATION

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, June 11 marks the anniversary of the Canadian government's apology for the residential school program.

Canadians now know more about their colonial history, the abuses suffered by first nations, Métis, and Inuit people at the hands of their government, and they know more about their indigenous neighbours and the culture that they celebrate. Though 10 years may seem like a long time, we have an even longer process ahead of us.

I am inspired by the work of our youth, who lead us in ways that adults have never led. Like the students in the Treaty Four club at Riverview Collegiate in Moose Jaw, who learn from and educate their peers about local first nations culture. Their work encourages us all to pursue reconciliation through learning and teaching about indigenous culture.

On our national day of healing and reconciliation, I call on everyone in Canada to follow the example of these students and find ways to turn the promise of reconciliation into action within their communities.

* * *

APOLOGY FOR RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today, Prime Minister Harper gave a heartfelt apology to former students and their families for Canada's role in the operation of residential schools. In it he stated:

> The Government of Canada built an educational system in which very young children were often forcibly removed from their homes, often taken far from their communities. Many were inadequately fed, clothed and housed. All were deprived of the care and nurturing of their parents, grandparents and communities. First Nations, Inuit and Métis languages and cultural practices were prohibited in these schools. Tragically, some of these children died while attending residential schools and others never returned home.

Today, I am honoured to recognize the courage of thousands of survivors who told their stories. Their message is now being passed on in schools and communities across Canada.

We all must acknowledge this painful history and walk the reconciliation journey together.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EDUCATION FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the G7 summit in Charlevoix was a huge success, in particular with the historic announcement of a $3.8-billion investment in education for women and girls in conflict situations and fragile states. Gender equality, and the right to education for women and girls have been priorities for this government since day one.

[*English*]

Our feminist international assistance policy is making a real difference for women and girls around the world, and this announcement for Canada and our partners, the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, the European Union, and the World Bank, is a new and remarkable example.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the non-governmental associations involved in making this accomplishment a reality.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, Canadians witnessed, with shock and dismay, the U.S. administration hurl insults, verbal attacks, and threats of more tariffs at us. We are all Canadians first, and we will stand with Canadian workers and the families impacted by this escalating trade war.

Can the Prime Minister tell Canadians what his plan is to resolve this impasse that we have with our closest ally and trading partner?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. friend for her question and also thank members of the House and the great number of Canadians who have encouraged our government to continue to stand up for Canadian workers, as we are committed to doing.

What the weekend told us is that the idea that there is a national security concern that the United States might have with respect to aluminum and steel industries in Canada, and the hard-working women and men who earn their living from those sectors, is in fact incorrect. We will always stand with Canadian workers and thank our colleagues opposite for their support.

● (1420)

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, and I know we all know this, when politicians fight and when leaders argue, it is always the people who suffer. In this case, these unfair tariffs are hurting Canadian steel and aluminum workers, and additional sectors are being threatened.

The government has said that the projected deficit is going to be just over $18 billion next year. Does the projected deficit account for a potential aid package to help mitigate the damage from this dispute?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, we have said to Canadian steel and aluminum workers that this government and, in fact, all Canadians will have their backs.

We have been unequivocal. These tariffs imposed by the United States are unacceptable. The Canadian and American economies are so closely linked that American tariffs will also hurt American workers.

Our Prime Minister and our government have met with leaders of the industry to discuss how we can best support these workers. A few months ago, we told workers in their manufacturing plants that their government will have their backs. We will not stop working to support these sectors so vital to the economy of the whole country.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are some things we could do right now that would create opportunities for Canadians who are impacted by this growing trade dispute.

We could immediately ratify the TPP, the carbon tax on Canadian families and businesses could be scrapped, and we could eliminate trade barriers between provinces. These would all have positive effects.

Will the Prime Minister begin working with Conservatives on these constructive solutions that will help Canadian families who will be impacted by this trade war?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question from my hon. colleague. As she well knows, it is a top priority, obviously, to ratify the CPTPP, and we are going to move quickly to introduce legislation before the House rises this summer.

Canadians know that we have a good agreement that is going to open markets for them. We obviously welcome the Conservatives' offer to work with us. What we want to do is to have the best deal for Canadians from coast to coast to coast, so that workers and industries across this country understand that we will always open markets so that they can prosper today and in the future.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after three years in office, the Liberal government is already running a $71-billion deficit, and that was before a trade war broke out with our top trading partner, the United States.

Can the Prime Minister tell us whether his government will use a portion of this year's $18-billion deficit to implement measures to help the workers who will be hit by this first, or will the Liberals add more billions to the current deficit?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question. I am grateful to all members of the House and all Canadians, who have shown tremendous support for our government's actions in support of steel and aluminum workers.

From the start, we said that the U.S. government's tariffs were completely unreasonable. We will continue to provide robust, effective support for these industries, which are so important to Canada's economy.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the first victims in any trade war are workers, businesses, and Canadians.

The problem is that the Liberal Party's 2018 budget does not include any funding to address potential complications or crises that arise in the NAFTA negotiations.

Can the Prime Minister tell us how he plans to support Canadian workers? Does he plan to impose the retaliatory tariffs originally announced for July 1 immediately, instead of waiting until then to implement them?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said unequivocally that these tariffs are completely unacceptable. We will take a balanced but firm approach in order to support the Canadian economy.

The Canadian and American economies are so closely linked that this American decision will also harm workers in the United States.

We have met with leaders and workers in these industries on a number of occasions to see how the federal government can support them. We will continue to support these women and men who are so important to the Canadian economy.

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, New Democrats stand in solidarity with the government and the Prime Minister against the provocative statements made by the Trump administration.

[*English*]

The current tariffs are illegal and the additional threats will hurt Canadian and American workers. While Canadians stand together, President Trump stands alone. American lawmakers and U.S. allies strongly oppose Trump's erratic behaviour against their biggest and closest friend.

Will the government work with all parties in the House to present a unified response to Trump?

● (1425)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple. Yes, we will obviously work with all members of the House to stand up for Canadian workers to ensure that the women and men in these sectors so important to our economy are protected. We will also work with all members of the House to ensure that the response our government takes to these unjustified and unreasonable tariffs is measured and proportionate.

We have said publicly that the national security pretext is absurd, and frankly, insulting to Canadians. That is why we are moving forward responsibly with retaliatory tariffs that are equivalent to the ones the United States has unjustly applied to Canada.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for that response. Canadians need to know that we all are united in our response.

[*Translation*]

There is another issue of national importance. As we know, the Trans Mountain pipeline spilled 4,800 litres of oil just two days before the government announced its intention of buying out the pipeline. The spill risks are very real, and there is no way to deal with a spill at this time.

It was also just reported that two indigenous nations in British Columbia are actually opposed to the pipeline project but felt they had no choice but to sign letters of support.

Will the government admit to the House today that it failed in its duty to consult first nations?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, getting resources to market is a responsibility for every government, but it must be done with the greatest respect for the safety and protection of the environment.

The Pipeline Safety Act strengthens Canada's pipeline safety system by enshrining the polluter pays principle in law.

Under this act, companies are liable for any faults and must have sufficient resources to respond to such incidents. We promised Canadians that we would restore confidence in our regulatory processes, and that is what we are doing.

[*English*]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, two days before the Liberals bought a 65-year-old pipeline for $4.5 billion, that pipeline sprang a leak, but do not worry, said Kinder Morgan, it is just 100 litres. It turns out that the oil spill was 48 times larger than that, and thank God it did not happen over water, because these guys still do not know how to clean it up.

Did anyone ever buy a used car and turn it on and it sounded real strange, but the seller cranked up the radio and said not to worry about it? That is exactly what the Liberals just did, maybe buying the biggest lemon in Canadian history. What kind of climate leader goes out and buys a 65-year-old, leaky pipeline anyway?

Hon. Jim Carr (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are many questions in that question, but I will answer the first one first. Getting resources to market is a fundamental responsibility of any government, but that must be done with the highest regard to safety and the protection of the environment. The Pipeline Safety Act strengthens Canada's pipeline safety system, enshrining the polluter pays principle into federal law. Companies will be held liable, regardless of fault, and be required to have the resources, up to $1 billion, to respond to incidents.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I guess, being the owners, they have to put $1 billion aside they have not told us about.

Whenever the Liberals talk about the pipeline, they love to wave around so-called agreements with first nations, but they will not ever tell us what those agreements actually are.

Here is what Chief Robert Joseph said, one of the people the Liberals say support the pipeline:

> At the end of the day, we are not really in favour of any pipeline, but we believe it's going to go through anyway. They will not listen to anybody and that's the history of consultation with First Nations people..... They consult and go ahead and do what they were going to do anyways.

Enough with the fake consultations. Enough with the divide and conquer strategies. When are the Liberals actually going to stand up for the principle of free, prior, and informed consent?

Hon. Jim Carr (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government does not speak on behalf of first nations. Why does the hon. member think he can? The billion dollars is not government money. It is the polluter pays principle in the Pipeline Safety Act.

The hon. member knows that there are communities that have different points of view on pipelines, including governments that all wear the New Democratic stripe. This is the time to bind people together, not divide them.

* * *

● (1430)

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the storm clouds have been gathering for a long time. Last year, when the government had an opportunity to save up for a rainy day, it blew all of its good fortune and ran deficits that were twice what they promised during the election, deficits that it now says will continue until 2045.

Now that those storm clouds have turned into rain, does the government acknowledge that it failed to prepare Canadians for a rainy day?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are happy to talk about how we have prepared our economy for the future. What we have done is made investments in Canadians. We started from day one, saying that what we needed to focus on was making sure that we got out from the very difficult employment situation, 7.1% unemployment, left to us by the previous Harper government.

Now, fast forward a couple of years, we have the lowest unemployment rate we have seen in 40 years. The investments we have made in Canadians have worked. Our growth has improved. We are in a resilient situation from which to deal with challenges. Whether they come from the south, whether they come from our ability to get to international resource markets, those are—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government lucked out with a very short-term housing boom, a doubling of oil prices, and a roaring world economy. Many of these same factors are now in peril, yet instead of preparing for these difficult times, it has spent the cupboard bare with deficits that were twice and sometimes three times as big as it promised during the election. How can the government have been so irresponsible?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us think about what was actually done to improve our economy. We started by lowering taxes on middle-class Canadians. We moved forward with child benefits for nine out of 10 families, giving them an average of $2,300 more after tax for their families.

The kinds of things we did led to more disposable income for Canadians so they could put it back into our economy, creating growth and enabling us to be in a position where we can be resilient against challenges. That is where we are today. We are in a very fortunate situation where the right policies put us in a better position from which to deal with the challenges we face.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister is fond of quoting the Fraser Institute with regard to the Kinder Morgan pipeline. He uses that institute's data to justify his position on that issue. That same institute says that 81% of middle-class taxpayers are paying more income tax since his government took office, $800 more. Now he wants to stack on top of those tax increases a carbon tax. Before the House leaves for the summer, will he tell us how much that carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians expect us to be thoughtful about how we grow our economy and how we actually address the threat of climate change. They know that a thoughtful climate plan needs to include a range of measures, some of them regulatory, such as the phase-out of coal and methane emissions, and investments in clean technology and investments in infrastructure, but a thoughtful plan also includes a price on carbon pollution.

We will continue to take practical, cost-effective measures to tackle climate change. That is what Canadians expect us to do. The question I have for the leader of the opposition is, where is your climate plan?

The Speaker: I am afraid I have to remind the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment to direct his comments to the Chair.

The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question is, when we direct an issue to the finance minister, why does he always go hiding? This was a fiscal question, a tax question. He has already raised taxes on 80% of middle-class taxpayers, according to the Fraser Institute. That is before the carbon tax, which he wants this House to approve in his budget bill.

The question, again, for the finance minister, if he is not still in hiding, is how much that tax will cost the average Canadian family.

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government was elected on a platform to invest in Canadians, to grow the economy, and to protect the environment. Our plan is working. Canada's emissions are dropping, and our economy is growing. Since we formed government, hard-working Canadians have created 60% more full-time jobs than the Harper Conservatives did over the same period. We are leading all G7 countries in economic growth.

Addressing climate change in a substantive way is something all Canadians expect. It is something we must do for our children. We are doing it in a thoughtful way, and we are growing our economy at the same time.

● (1435)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, you know how much I appreciate it when members speak both official languages. I will therefore give the Minister of Finance the opportunity to respond in French. Everyone in Canada will know that he speaks French very well.

The question is on the Liberal carbon tax. The government knows full well how much the Liberal carbon tax is going to cost Canadian families. The problem is that the Liberals have the document in their hands and are keeping it from Canadians.

Why play hide and seek with Canadians, Mr. Minister of Finance?

The Speaker: As the parliamentary secretary just pointed out, I will remind the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent that he is to address his comments to the Chair.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government was elected on a platform to invest in Canadians, stimulate the economy, and protect the environment. Our plan is working. Canada's emissions are going down and our economy is growing.

Since we formed the government, Canadians have created 60% more full-time jobs than Stephen Harper's Conservatives did during the same period. We also have the strongest economic growth in the G7. Our plan is working.

* * *

FINANCE

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, you are right. You can speak both French and English, as can the Minister of Finance. Once again, I am giving him the opportunity to speak French to all Canadians.

With regard to the deficit, those people were elected by promising to run small deficits and attain a zero deficit by 2019. Instead, we have a colossal deficit that is three times the amount anticipated, and we have no idea when we will return to a balanced budget.

Can the Minister of Finance tell us, either in French or in English, but preferably in French, when we will return to a balanced budget?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our approach because it is the right one for Canadian families. We decided to invest in Canadian workers. That is very important to our efforts to grow the economy and reduce our unemployment rate. The unemployment rate is the lowest it has been in 40 years. That is good for our economy and for families. Our economy is resilient for the future.

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians were faced with a barrage of tweets and headlines after President Trump's G7 visit this weekend. His destructive comments about our industries, workers, and leaders will not help resolve the barriers we face in NAFTA.

New Democrats believe we must stand up to Trump. The government cannot let jobs in steel, aluminum, farming, and manufacturing go unprotected. Could the minister tell the House what the government has planned for next steps to resolve this ever-growing trade dispute with our largest trading partner?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we certainly share my colleague's concerns. In terms of supporting Canadian workers in the sectors she identified, we view these American trade actions as unreasonable and unjustified. The Prime Minister has said to Mr. Trump, privately, everything he has also said publicly.

We look forward to working with all members of the House, and more importantly, with all Canadians as well, to support workers in these sectors and show the Americans that these trade actions will, in fact, have a negative impact on American workers as well.

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in one of those tweets yesterday, the president stated that he is still considering a tariff on the Canadian auto sector. Trump maintains that Canadian autos are a security threat to the U.S., but we all know that there is no greater security partner to the U.S. than Canada.

Sixty-five per cent of all car parts in Canadian assembled vehicles are made in the U.S., and 120,000 Canadian workers will be the first to pay the price. How is the government preparing for what could be a devastating attack on Canada's auto industry?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for Canadian auto workers to know that our government stands firmly with them in the face of this seemingly ridiculous American threat.

With respect to the national security investigation, let me be extremely clear. The idea that Canada and Canadian cars should pose any kind of security threat to the United States is, frankly, absurd. We will continue to raise this issue at the highest levels, as the Prime Minister did directly with the president and the minister did with Secretary Ross, as well. We will always support Canadian auto workers, and we look forward to working with all members of the House in that regard.

* * *

● (1440)

CARBON PRICING

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the people of Ontario have given a clear message that they do not want a carbon tax. The Prime Minister's carbon tax is an attack on middle-class Canadians, a high cost on those who can least afford to pay it.

At this time of uncertainty, higher taxes will just make things worse. When will the Prime Minister stop forcing his carbon tax on Canadians?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very fortunate to have provincial and territorial leaders from coast to coast to coast who are taking serious action on climate change. Four provinces already price carbon pollution, and they led the country in growth last year.

As the Premier of Manitoba said on Friday, his government is moving ahead with putting a price on pollution because he knows it will "help the environment without hurting the economy."

Doing our part to address climate change should not be a partisan issue. As Canadians, we all have a responsibility to take action to protect the environment and grow the economy for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Ontarians in my riding and across the province voted last week against a Liberal-imposed carbon tax. By removing the Liberal party's official status, the people of Ontario have spoken, sending a clear signal that they will not accept the Prime Minister's scheme for higher taxes.

We know taxes make life more expensive for families, increasing the cost of home heating, electricity, groceries, gasoline, and much more. When will the Prime Minister stop forcing this rejected job-killing tax upon Canadians?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians expect us to grow our economy and protect the environment for our children and our grandchildren. They know that a thoughtful climate plan includes regulatory measures, significant investments in clean technology and infrastructure, and a price on pollution to incent efficiency and grow the economy. As we saw in the Ontario election, 60% of Ontario voters supported parties that approved carbon pricing.

We will continue to take practical cost-effective measures to tackle climate change and grow a clean economy. That is what Canadians expect us to do. I ask again ask Leader of the Opposition, through you, Mr. Speaker, where is your climate plan?

The Speaker: I remind the hon. parliamentary secretary again, that when he uses the word "you" or "your", he is referring to the Speaker. Some people think you are demanding a plan of some sort from the Speaker, which seems rather unusual.

The hon. member for Flamborough—Glanbrook.

Mr. David Sweet (Flamborough—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, Ontarians roundly rejected the Liberals' higher taxes and irresponsible spending of the Liberal government. They rejected years of Liberal mismanagement and scandal. Most of all, they rejected the Liberal carbon tax.

Last week the voters in this province spoke loudly and clearly. When will the Prime Minister start listening and stop forcing his destructive carbon tax on Canadians?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that any thoughtful plan to address climate change and grow a clean growth economy requires a range of measures, including regulatory measures such as limiting methane emissions and including significant investments in growing a clean growth economy through specific investments in clean technology. It also includes a price on carbon pollution, something that virtually every economist in this world will endorse.

For the hon. members across the aisle, who seem to think that pricing of carbon pollution was rejected in the Ontario election, 60% of Ontarians voted for parties that approved and supported our carbon pricing.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): In the galaxy, Mr. Speaker. A recent IPSOS poll found that 72% of Ontario residents saw a carbon tax as just a tax grab, while 68% saw it as a purely symbolic gesture. In other words, they see it for what it is.

Last week, in the only poll that matters, the people of Ontario voted against the federal Liberal carbon tax and the rhetoric it used to force it down our throats. The Liberal carbon tax will hurt people who can least afford it. Therefore, will the Prime Minister stop forcing his carbon tax grab on Canadians?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, addressing climate change is a critical imperative of our time. It is something that we deserve, and our children deserve, to be focused on. However, we need to do it in thoughtful and constructive ways.

Our focus on growing a clean growth economy concurrently with addressing climate change with substantive proposals that include the accelerated phase out coal, reducing methane emissions, and investments in green infrastructure will enable us to grow a clean growth economy and concurrently meet our international obligations to address climate change.

* * *

●(1445)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister was asked by an American journalist about our supply management system. He said "We were moving towards flexibility in those areas that I thought was very, very promising". Last week the U.S. agriculture secretary said that the Canadian government offered to allow in more surplus U.S. dairy imports as a part of NAFTA renegotiations.

We need a clear answer. Will the Minister of Agriculture stand in the House today, drop the talking points, and stop making concessions in our supply-managed sectors, yes or no?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said many times in the House, our government strongly supports and is fully committed to maintaining the supply management system. The Prime Minister has indicated this clearly, as have I. Cabinet ministers, caucus, and our negotiators at the NAFTA table have also indicated this very clearly.

It is important to note that this is the party that fought to implement supply management, and I can assure my hon. colleague that this is the government that will defend supply management.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Quebec milk producers are calling for an end to compromises on supply management. The milk industry has had enough of being a bargaining chip in trade agreements. Enough is enough. The NDP is clear: Canada must stop making concessions at the expense of Quebec producers. The government must not be flexible. It must be tough, and it must fully protect supply management in the NAFTA renegotiation.

I have a simple question. Will the government do that?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of International Development and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is firmly committed to protecting supply management. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-food, and all members of our caucus believe in supply management, and we are committed to protecting it.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that plastic waste and marine litter pose a growing threat to our oceans and marine life. The health of our oceans and seas is fundamental to the way of life of shoreline communities across the country. Healthy oceans help provide good jobs and support economic prosperity for all. We need to take practical measures to protect our environment.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change explain how the Government of Canada intends to help reduce plastic waste here in Canada?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook for his question. The Government of Canada is determined to protect our environment and preserve our waterways so that all Canadians can continue to benefit from our oceans, lakes, and rivers. That is why I am proud to confirm that, as part of the Charlevoix blueprint for healthy oceans, seas and resilient coastal communities, the Government of Canada has committed to take measures to improve recycling systems in order to promote clean growth and create good jobs for Canadians.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, my leader and I went to Saint-Bernard-de-Lacolle. We saw that there are some very fine facilities that continue to welcome more illegal entrants and a transportation service to take these illegals to the community of their choice. In our view, we have a government that instead of wanting to solve the border crisis is only providing for its long-term management and not putting an end to it.

Does the minister believe that Canada should have two parallel immigration systems? Does he intend to renegotiate the safe third country agreement?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship is in discussions with his American counterpart on the safe third country agreement. We are pleased that the Leader of the Opposition finally visited Lacolle last week. We are very proud of the fact that he said that the RCMP and the Canada Border Services officers demonstrated a high level of professionalism in running operations. We are very pleased that he has finally realized this.

● (1450)

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Transport for answering the question on behalf of another minister, and, yes, of course I saw what an excellent job our officers are doing, and I am proud of that. The problem, though, is that they are enforcing the law, and the current law has a loophole that allows people to enter Canada through Roxham Road. That has to change.

Can the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship confirm whether he is renegotiating the safe third country agreement to fix this problem?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to ensuring the safety and security of Canadians, protecting our well-managed immigration system, and meeting our international obligations.

[*English*]

I am very glad the member opposite visited Lacolle. He got a chance to see the professionalism of our front-line staff. Maybe he also got a chance to thank them for the great work they are doing at the port of entry. In addition to that, I hope he explained to them the reason why he and his party chose to cut $390 million from CBSA, further jeopardizing border security operations.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today we are debating Iran and its destabilizing influence in the world. The Iranian regime has been involved in the deaths of thousands of people, including Canadian citizens. It has been funding terror groups across the Middle East, including Hamas, which has been active recently in Gaza. Last week Iran's supreme leader openly called for genocide against the Jewish people.

My question is simple. Why does the government seek to warm relations with a regime that can only be described as tyrannical?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. Our government will always defend human rights and hold Iran to account for its actions. The focus of any discussions we have with the Government of Iran will be on ensuring the return of Maryam Mombeini, that she is able to return safely to Canada, and on demanding answers in the death of Professor Seyed-Emami.

Let me also be clear. Our government is committed to holding Iran to account for violations of human and democratic rights. That is why Canada led a resolution at the United Nations in November, calling on Iran to comply with its international human rights obligations.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like the government will be supporting our motion. This is contrary to its expansion of Canadian presence in Iran. It is contrary to its desire to sell aircraft to Iran. It is contrary to one of its own members hosting delegations from Iran in Canada.

Will the minister commit to supporting our motion and ceasing all dealings with the Iranian regime?

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. We deeply oppose Iran's support for terrorist organizations, its threats toward Israel, its ballistic missile program, and its support for the murderous Assad regime in Syria. As my colleague just said, the focus of any discussions with the Government of Iran will be on ensuring the safe return of Maryam Mombeini and to ask it questions in the suspicious death of her husband, Professor Seyed-Emami.

In November, Canada led a UN resolution calling on Iran to comply with its human rights obligations. We will always hold Iran to account for its actions.

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the plastics charter that the Prime Minister signed at the G7 disappointed almost everyone. The Prime Minister did not even mention a strategy for reducing plastic use or a ban on single-use plastics. Canadians want meaningful action and legislation that will reduce the use of plastics to protect our oceans, and they want them now.

Will the Prime Minister promise to work with the provinces, municipalities, and indigenous communities to implement a national strategy to combat plastic pollution?

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, plastic pollution is a growing problem in Canada and around the world. We want to lead by example by reducing the use of single-use plastic within government, increasing how much plastic is recycled and reused, and avoiding purchasing products that come in non-reusable plastic packaging. We are working very hard on this.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this week, Canada signed a so-called ocean plastics charter at the G7 that left Canadians disappointed. Canadians were expecting an action plan with strategies and clear targets, but instead we got a non-binding, vague outline that misses the mark entirely.

A&W Canada, the U.K., Vancouver, and Seattle have all taken leadership to eliminate single-use plastics, but the Liberals still lack the courage it takes to solve the plastics problem here at home.

Where is the Prime Minister's commitment to a real, effective, and bold national strategy to combat plastic pollution?

● (1455)

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, plastic pollution is clearly a growing problem in Canada and around the world. We are looking at the best ways to lead by example, reducing plastic use within government, increasing how much plastic can be recycled or reused, and avoiding purchasing products that come in non-recyclable packaging.

We recognize the important work being done by municipalities, provinces, and businesses, and we are looking to work with them to develop an effective national strategy. It is important we actually are working with others who have been doing work in this area to ensure that it is an effective and thoughtful national strategy. Prince Edward Island, Montreal, St. John's, Victoria have all taken a step forward, and we will work with them actively.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, thousands of young Canadians have been denied summer jobs because the groups that would have hired them refuse to bow to the Prime Minister's imposed values test. One group that ticked the PM's attestation box is the Islamic Humanitarian Service. At the annual al-Quds' Iranian hatefest at the Ontario legislature, Sheikh Shafiq Hudda, of this same organization, called for genocide, the eradication of Israelis. The minister claimed that the Liberals' imposed values would protect rights. What does she say today?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is very proud of the fact that it is our government that doubled the Canada summer jobs program, ensuring that over 70,000 kids each summer since we have taken office have had the opportunity to get good, quality summer jobs. All organizations that are approved through the Canada summer jobs program must adhere to the terms and conditions of the program. If in fact an organization does not adhere to those terms and conditions, it is not eligible for the reimbursement of that student's salary. I encourage the member to bring those concerns forward to the department.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there was an illegal protest yesterday in Toronto, where Sheik Shafiq Hudda, from the Islamic Humanitarian Service, made hateful statements calling for the eradication of the Israeli people. A police complaint was filed.

However, as we now know, this organization received funding from the Liberal government through the Canada summer jobs program, in the riding represented by the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons. Promoting genocide is a crime.

What does the minister have to say to this, and how can she be proud of such a blunder?

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all applicants for the Canada summer jobs program must submit an application, which is thoroughly vetted by the department. We ask that the organizations do not use their summer students in a way that would fundamentally work to undermine the rights of Canadians. That is why any organization that receives these monies and uses them in a way that does not adhere to the terms and conditions will not receive reimbursement for that summer student. I encourage the member to bring the name forward to the department.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, a small historic sawmill museum in Nova Scotia said it will close its doors indefinitely because it was denied funding from the Canada summer jobs program. For the past decade, the museum has used funds to hire students for daily tours. However, this year it refused to sign the Liberals' values test. The Liberals are forcing Canadians to say that their values are the Prime Minister's values, and are imposing fiscal consequences if they do not. How can the Prime Minister justify stopping funding for a non-profit, non-religious museum, and killing summer jobs for students in Nova Scotia because of his values test?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am incredibly proud of this government. It has put youth employment, and the goal of ensuring that young students get job experience, at the front and foremost of our plan to ensure that young people have success in the workplace. We have helped hundreds of faith-based groups, not-for-profits, businesses, and public sector groups hire students. We will meet our target of 70,000 students again this year. While the Conservative Party continues to engage in a campaign of misinformation and fear, we are ensuring that 70,000 young people have good jobs this summer that will help them in their future.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last fall, the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls released its interim report. One of the recommendations it included called for the creation of a living legacy through the commemoration of the women and girls and two-spirited people who have lost their lives. Can the Minister of Status of Women please tell this House what actions our government is taking to honour the legacy of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls?

● (1500)

Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Status of Women, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her effective advocacy on behalf of the people of Brampton North.

In response to the commission's interim report, our government announced a commemoration fund worth $10 million over the next two years, for national, regional, and local indigenous groups and women's organizations to honour the lives and legacies of our stolen sisters. Our government remains committed to advancing reconciliation and ending the national tragedy of missing and murdered indigenous women and girls.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week in Uganda, I met many LGBTI refugees. They told me about the incredible discrimination and persecution they have faced, even from the UNHCR. However, the Prime Minister has refused to make the rainbow refugee assistance program permanent, has significantly reduced the ratio of LGBTI refugees that Canada accepts, and refuses to press the UN for improvement reforms to LGBTI protection in its resettlement programs. Will the Prime Minister make the rainbow RAP program permanent?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the record that this government has had with respect to promoting LGBTQ2 rights both domestically and abroad. We have worked with the UNHCR and private sponsors to identify the most vulnerable refugees, including members of the LGBTQ2 community. We have funded the Rainbow Refugee Society for two years. We have worked very closely with them on identification of those cases. The fact of the matter is that our record speaks for itself. The record of the Conservative Party is one of a party where, when their minister of immigration was caught removing LGBTQ2 rights from the citizenship guide, it was after an uproar that he put it back in.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Hélène Laverdière (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Saudi Arabia is now the largest non-U.S. destination for Canadian military exports, but how many exports were sent to the U.S.? Well, we do not know, because the Canadian government does not track or regulate these exports. Today we are voting on Bill C-47, which does not address this massive loophole. However, the experts and the 23,000 citizens who recently signed a petition say that this must be fixed before Canada accedes to the Arms Trade Treaty.

Will the government work with the experts and fix that bill?

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to get up in this House many times to talk about how proud our government is to see Bill C-47 move through Parliament so Canada can accede to the ATT. Here is what Bill C-47 would allow Canada to do. It would allow Canada to set an example for countries that do not have effective arms controls. It would enshrine international human rights law and gender-based violence, in law, as criteria for arms exports, and it would control arms brokering. It would allow Canada to do all of that, and the NDP voted against it all as well.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, young entrepreneurs from across Canada are in Ottawa today to receive mentorship and to learn from business leaders. I am so pleased that one of those young entrepreneurs is Coltin Handrahan from my riding. He is aggressive, and he wants to build for the future.

Would the Minister of Small Business and Tourism be so kind as to tell the House what the government has in mind to give these young folks the opportunities to build a more prosperous Canada?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 25 youth from across our country are here in the nation's capital for Youth Can Do It. With the support of the Business Development Bank of Canada and Futurpreneur, we are helping Canada's young entrepreneurs get the mentorship, skills development, and start-up financing they need to bring their ideas to market. Budget 2017 provided $14 million to Futurpreneur so it can help even more young entrepreneurs, almost half of whom are women. I would like to thank my colleague from Malpeque for his continued support of young entrepreneurs, including the shout-out to Coltin from his riding, founder of Golden Custom Clothing.

* * *

ETHICS

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries is under federal investigation for awarding a lucrative surf clam quota to his Liberal friends and family. His shady conduct has ensured that clam harvesting will not even happen this year, because the company he personally selected cannot even buy a boat. Meanwhile, the hard-working people of Grand Bank are losing their jobs because this minister wanted to make a few bucks for his friends.

Will the Prime Minister put an end to clam scam once and for all, and stand up for the people of Grand Bank?

● (1505)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government will continue to stand up for the hard-working women and men, and not only of Newfoundland and Labrador who work in the fishery and the fish processing sector. My colleague, who represents Grand Bank, has been working on a number of proposals in partnership with indigenous communities and others, which will bring greater prosperity to his constituency and hopefully the people of Grand Bank as well. Our decision to include indigenous partners in the lucrative surf clam fishery was the right decision, and we continue to believe that this offers opportunities for reconciliation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MARIJUANA

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the House received a batch of 46 amendments to its cannabis bill, a massive amount that shows that the government has to go back to the drawing board. Among those amendments, there is one that is crucial to Quebec and would specifically prevent Ottawa from infringing on the right of the provinces to regulate home cultivation. Enough is enough with Ottawa's need for control.

The Liberals have so far been stubborn and dogmatic.

Will they finally listen to reason and accept this rather essential change?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the current approach to cannabis is not working. It allows criminals to profit from cannabis and has not managed to keep it out of the hands of our children.

However, our government is legalizing, regulating, and strictly controlling access to cannabis, and we are pleased that Bill C-45 was passed by the Senate last week. Our government is carefully examining the amendments made by the Senate and we will come back with a response later this week.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Simon Marcil (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last week, the Prime Minister climbed into a truck cab in Chicoutimi to make a stump-like speech that included a promise to protect supply management in NAFTA negotiations.

I would like to remind the government that, on September 26, the House adopted a unanimous motion to fully preserve supply management.

Will the government heed the unanimous will of the House of Commons, or will it break its promises as it did with CETA and the TPP?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of International Development and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is fully committed to protecting the supply management system. Our Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Agriculture, the 41 Quebec MPs, and our entire caucus believe in the supply management system, and we will protect it. Ours is the party that created the supply management system, and we will protect it.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Hon. Hunter Tootoo (Nunavut, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, *qujannamiik uqaqti* . My question is for the Minister of Indigenous Services.

Last week, I asked the Prime Minister a question regarding the recent declaration of crisis by two communities in my riding, declarations that stem from a lack of mental health services and an increase in suicide attempts.

Although I appreciate the answer provided, the funding mentioned is not solely intended for mental health support. Like other existing funding, it fails to address the need. These crises demonstrate that.

Will the minister commit to funding the mental health service and support needed by Nunavummiut?

Hon. Jane Philpott (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to reassure the member for Nunavut that our budgets, both in 2017 and in 2018, had significant investments for mental wellness and addictions treatment. In fact, this year alone, for Nunavut, we have investments of $8.4 million for mental health priorities in that territory.

As the member may know, the funding allocations are determined in partnership with organizations like Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. We are also happy, of course, to work with the Government of Nunavut to make sure that we have appropriate investments. We will continue to work with all partners, and look forward to the opportunity to working with the member himself.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: For people across the country, Canadian Armed Forces Day is an opportunity to honour the sacrifices that our military personnel make on our behalf.

[*English*]

It is my pleasure to draw to the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of six members of the Canadian Forces who are taking part in Canadian Armed Forces Day today: Colonel Colleen Forestier, Sergeant Mena Ghattas, Sergeant Shirley Jardine, Leading Seaman Philippe Mercier-Provencher, Corporal Matthew Tate, and Ranger Judy Morris.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

* * *

● (1510)

CANADA-U.S. TRADE

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in a moment I will be seeking the House's consent for a motion.

At this difficult moment in our history with our U.S. neighbours, Canadians need to know that all sides of the House stand united as one.

Mr. Speaker, there have been talks amongst the parties and I believe if you seek it, you will find consent for the following motion. I move:

That the House:

(*a*) recognize the importance of Canada's long-standing, mutually beneficial trading relationship with the United States of America;

(*b*) stand with Canadian workers in communities that directly or indirectly depend on this trading relationship;

(*c*) strongly oppose the illegitimate tariffs imposed by the U.S. government against Canadian steel and aluminum workers;

(*d*) stand in solidarity with the Government of Canada in its decision to impose retaliatory tariffs;

(*e*) remain united in support of Canadian farmers and supply management, which is integral for dairy, chicken, turkey, and egg farming;

(*f*) reject disparaging ad hominem statements by U.S. officials which do a disservice to bilateral relations and work against efforts to resolve this trade dispute.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACT

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: It being 3:12 p.m., pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motions at report stage of Bill C-69.

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 15 to 23, 28 to 61, 100 to 103, 105 to 147, 149 to 205, 208 to 214, and 216.

A negative vote on Motion No. 1 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 11.

● (1520)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 739)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Barlow	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Brassard
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Finley
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Gourde	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rayes

Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Strahl
Sweet
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong

Rempel
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 80

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Christopherson
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dubé
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Drouin
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès

Mendicino
Monsef
Morneau
Nantel
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumiy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Vaughan
Weir
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 211

Mihychuk
Moore
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

Duclos — Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 15 to 23, 28 to 61, 100 to 103, 105 to 147, 149 to 205, 208 to 214, and 216 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 3. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 25.

The hon. Chief Government Whip on a point of order.

[*English*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will vote no.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the members of Québec Debout agree to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes on the Green Party amendment.

[*English*]

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the vote and I will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I do agree to apply the vote and I will be voting no.

The Speaker: Do members agree to proceed in this manner?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

● (1525)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 740)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Benson
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias	Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau	Cannings
Choquette	Christopherson
Cullen	Davies
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Fortin	Garrison
Hardcastle	Hughes
Johns	Jolibois
Kwan	Laverdière
MacGregor	Malcolmson
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Moore	Nantel
Pauzé	Plamondon
Quach	Ramsey
Rankin	Sansoucy
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Thibeault	Weir — 44

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barlow
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bouchet
Brassard	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Carr
Carrie	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Chong	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Deltell
Dhillon	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Drouin	Dubourg
Duguid	Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz	Easter
Eglinski	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fergus	Fillmore
Finley	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Gallant	Garneau
Généreux	Genuis
Gerretsen	Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Gourde
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harder
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hoback	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jeneroux
Jowhari	Kang
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Leblanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leitch	Leslie
Levitt	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Lockhart
Longfield	Ludwig
Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Monsef
Morneau	Motz
Murray	Nassif
Nater	Nault
Ng	Nicholson
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
O'Toole	Ouellette
Paradis	Paul-Hus
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poilievre
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Rusnak
Saini	Sahota
Samson	Sajjan
Sarai	Sangha
Scarpaleggia	Saroya
Schmale	Schiefke
Serré	Schulte
Shanahan	Sgro
Shields	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Shipley
Sikand	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sopuck	Simms
	Sorbara

Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vandenbeld
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga 247

Spengemann
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Van Loan
Vaughan
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

PAIRED

Members

Duclos Gill 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 25 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 9, 10, 12, and 13.

● (1530)

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 741)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Benson
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Choquette
Cullen
Dubé
Dusseault
Fortin
Hardcastle
Johns
Kwan
MacGregor
Marcil
Mathyssen
Moore
Pauzé
Quach
Rankin
Ste-Marie
Thériault

Beaulieu
Blaikie
Bondrias
Brosseau
Caron
Christopherson
Davies
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Garrison
Hughes
Jolibois
Laverdière
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Plamondon
Ramsey
Samsonicy
Stetski
Weir 44

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Block

Albas
Aldag
Alleslev
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barlow
Beech
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault

Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Clement
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Finley
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hoback
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jowhari
Kelly
Khalid
Kmiec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Maguire
Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morneau
Murray
Nater
Ng
O'Connell
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Reid
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak

Boucher
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Clarke
Cooper
Cozzer
Dumoff
Deltell
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garneau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Harder
Harvey
Hehr
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Kang
Kent
Khera
Kuste
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Leslie
Liepert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney

McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef
Motz
Nassif
Nault
Nicholson
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peterson
Philpott
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Rayes
Rempel
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota

Saini
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sopuck
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vandenbeld
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga — 247

Sajjan
Sangha
Saroya
Schuefke
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Spengemann
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Van Loan
Vaughan
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

PAIRED

Members

Duclos — Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 9, 10, 12, and 13 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 5. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 8 and 148.

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with Liberal members voting no.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, and Conservatives will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, Québec Debout agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

● (1535)

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I agree, and vote yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply, and is voting yes.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and I will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang (Calgary Skyview, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply, and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 742)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Benson
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Choquette
Cullen
Dubé
Dusseault
Fortin
Hardcastle
Johns
Kwan
MacGregor
Marcil
Mathyssen
Moore
Pauzé
Quach
Rankin
Ste-Marie
Thériault

Beaulieu
Blaikie
Boudrias
Brosseau
Caron
Christopherson
Davies
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Garrison
Hughes
Jolibois
Laverdière
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich — Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Plamondon
Ramsey
Sansoucy
Stetski
Weir — 44

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Block
Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Clement
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Finley
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert

Alleslev
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barlow
Beech
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Clarke
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Deltell
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garneau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Harder
Harvey
Hehr

Hoback	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Jeneroux
Jowhari	Kang
Kelly	Kent
Khalid	Khera
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leitch	Leslie
Levitt	Liepert
Lightbound	Lloyd
Lobb	Lockhart
Longfield	Ludwig
Lukiwski	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire	Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
May (Cambridge)	
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Monsef
Morneau	Motz
Murray	Nassif
Nater	Nault
Ng	Nicholson
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
O'Toole	Ouellette
Paradis	Paul-Hus
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poilievre
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Saroya
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schmale	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shipley
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sopuck	Sorbara
Sorenson	Spengemann
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Tilson	Tootoo
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wong	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young
Yurdiga — 247	

PAIRED

Members

Duclos	Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 8 and 148 defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 11. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 26 and 27.

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe if you seek it, you would find agreement to apply the result of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote, and the Conservatives will vote no.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, Québec Debout agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I agree and vote yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and votes yes for important amendments.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 743)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Beaulieu
Benson	Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet	Brosseau
Cannings	Caron
Choquette	Christopherson
Cullen	Davies
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Fortin	Garrison
Hardcastle	Hughes
Johns	Jolibois
Kwan	Laverdière
MacGregor	Malcolmson
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Moore	Nantel
Pauzé	Plamondon
Quach	Ramsey
Rankin	Sansoucy
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Thériault	Weir — 44

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Allesley
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub

Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Block
Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Clement
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Finley
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hoback
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jowhari
Kelly
Khalid
Kmiec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morneau
Murray
Nater
Ng
O'Connell
Oliver
O'Toole
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Bagnell
Barlow
Beech
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Clarke
Cooper
Cuzner
Damoff
Deltell
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garneau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Harder
Harvey
Hehr
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Kang
Kent
Khera
Kusie
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Leslie
Liepert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef
Motz
Nassif
Nault
Nicholson
Oliphant
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peterson
Philpott
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Reid
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schmale
Serré
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sopuck
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Tan
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vandenbeld
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga
Poilievre
Qualtrough
Rayes
Rempel
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Saroya
Schiefke
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Spengemann
Stubbs
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Van Loan
Vaughan
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young

PAIRED

Members

Duclos — Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 26 and 27 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 62. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 63, 64, 66 to 79, 81 to 99, 104, 206, 207, and 215.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with Liberal members voting no.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, with Conservatives voting yes.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will vote no this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the members of Québec Debout agree to apply the vote, but we will vote no.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote and will vote no.

[*English*]

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

● (1540)

(The House divided on Motion No. 62, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 744)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse Les Etchemins Lévis)
Boucher
Carrie
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Gennis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Maguire
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Strahl
Sweet
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Albas
Allison
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Chong
Clement
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont Dundas South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Rempel
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga 80

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Chagger
Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chen
Christopherson
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dubé
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen
May (Saanich Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef
Morneau
Nantel
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Vaughan
Weir
Choquette
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Drouin
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Moore
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Shohan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen

Wilkinson — Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj — Yip
Young — 211

PAIRED

Members

Duclos — Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 62 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 63, 64, 66 to 79, 81 to 99, 104, 206, 207, and 215 defeated.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.) moved that Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, as amended, be concurred in.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1545)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 745)

YEAS

Members

Aldag — Alghabra
Alleslev — Amos
Anandasangaree — Arseneault
Arya — Ayoub
Badawey — Bagnell
Bains — Baylis
Beech — Bennett
Bibeau — Bittle
Blair — Boissonnault
Bossio — Bratina
Breton — Brison
Caesar-Chavannes — Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) — Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger — Champagne
Chen — Cormier
Cuzner — Dabrusin
Damoff — DeCourcey
Dhillon — Drouin
Dubourg — Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz — Easter
Ehsassi — El-Khoury
Ellis — Erskine-Smith
Eyking — Eyolfson
Fergus — Fillmore
Fisher — Fonseca
Fortier — Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova) — Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr — Garneau
Gerretsen — Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale — Gould
Graham — Grewal
Hajdu — Hardie
Harvey — Hébert
Hehr — Hogg
Holland — Housefather
Hussen — Hutchings
Iacono — Jowhari
Kang — Khalid
Khera — Lambropoulos
Lametti — Lamoureux
Lapointe — Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc — Lebouthillier
Lefebvre — Leslie
Levitt — Lightbound
Lockhart — Longfield
Ludwig — MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau) — Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon — McGuinty
McKay — McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) — McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès — Mendicino
Mihychuk — Monsef
Morneau — Murray
Nassif — Nault
Ng — O'Connell
Oliphant — Oliver
O'Regan — Ouellette
Paradis — Peschisolido
Peterson — Petitpas Taylor
Philpott — Picard
Poissant — Qualtrough
Ratansi — Rioux
Robillard — Rodriguez
Rogers — Romanado
Rota — Rudd
Ruimy — Rusnak
Sahota — Saini
Sajjan — Samson
Sangha — Sarai
Scarpaleggia — Schiefke
Schulte — Serré
Sgro — Shanahan
Sheehan — Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South) — Sikand
Simms — Sorbara
Spengemann — Tabbara
Tan — Tassi
Tootoo — Vandenbeld
Vaughan — Virani
Whalen — Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould — Wrzesnewskyj
Yip — Young — 166

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif — Albas
Albrecht — Allison
Angus — Barlow
Barsalou-Duval — Beaulieu
Benson — Benzen
Bergen — Bernier
Berthold — Bezan
Blaikie — Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) — Block
Boucher — Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet — Brassard
Brosseau — Cannings
Caron — Carrie
Chong — Choquette
Christopherson — Clarke
Clement — Cooper
Cullen — Davies
Deltell — Diotte
Doherty — Dreeshen
Dubé — Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault — Duvall
Eglinski — Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)

Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Gallant	Garrison
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Gourde
Hardcastle	Harder
Hoback	Hughes
Jeneroux	Johns
Jolibois	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Laverdière	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Malcolmson
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore	Motz
Nantel	Nater
Nicholson	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Plamondon	Poilievre
Quach	Ramsey
Rankin	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Sansoucy	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Thériault	Tilson
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Weir	Wong
Yurdiga — 125	

PAIRED

Members

Duclos	Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

● (1550)

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT, 2017

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of Bill C-59, An Act respecting national security matters, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at report stage of Bill C-59.

The question is on Motion No. 1. The vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 2.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with Liberal members voting no. Please add the member for Winnipeg South as well.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, and we will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the members of Québec Debout agree to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I agree and vote yes.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I agree to the application and vote yes.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply, and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 746)

YEAS

Members

Angus	Benson
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet	Brosseau
Cannings	Caron
Choquette	Christopherson
Cullen	Davies
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Fortin	Garrison
Hardcastle	Hughes
Johns	Jolibois
Kwan	Laverdière
MacGregor	Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Moore
Nantel	Pauzé
Plamondon	Quach
Ramsey	Rankin
Sansoucy	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Thériault
Weir — 41	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Aldag
Alghabra	Alleslev
Allison	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Baylis
Beaulieu	Beech
Bennett	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Block	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boucher
Boudrias	Brassard
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Carr	Carrie
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne

Chen
Chong
Clarke
Clement
Cooper
Cormier
Cuzner
Dabrusin
Damoff
DeCourcey
Deltell
Dhillon
Diotte
Doherty
Dreeshen
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
Easter
Eglinski
Ehsassi
El Khoury
Ellis
Erskine Smith
Eyking
Eyolfson
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)
Fast
Fergus
Fillmore
Finley
Fisher
Fonseca
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gallant
Garneau
Généreux
Gennis
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale
Gould
Gourde
Graham
Grewal
Hajdu
Harder
Hardie
Harvey
Hébert
Hehr
Hoback
Hogg
Holland
Housefather
Hussen
Hutchings
Iacono
Jeneroux
Jowhari
Kang
Kelly
Kent
Khalid
Khera
Kmiec
Kusie
Lake
Lambropoulos
Lametti
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leblanc
Lebouthillier
Lefebvre
Leitch
Leslie
Levitt
Liepert
Lightbound
Lloyd
Lobb
Lockhart
Longfield
Ludwig
Lukiwski
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maguire
Maloney
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKay
McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès
Mendicino
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morneau
Motz
Murray
Nassif
Nater
Nault
Ng
Nicholson
O'Connell
Oliphant
Oliver
O'Regan
O'Toole
Ouellette
Paradis
Paul-Hus
Peschisolido
Peterson
Petitpas Taylor
Philpott
Picard
Poilievre
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Rayes
Reid
Rempel
Rioux
Robillard
Rodriguez
Rogers
Romanado
Rota
Rudd
Ruimy
Rusnak
Sahota
Saini
Sajjan
Samson
Sangha
Sarai
Saroya
Scarpaleggia
Schiefke
Schmale
Schulte
Serré
Sgro
Shanahan
Sheehan
Shields
Shipley
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand
Simms
Sopuck
Sorbara
Sorenson
Spengemann
Strahl
Stubbs
Sweet
Tabbara
Tan
Tassi
Tilson
Tootoo
Van Kesteren
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vaughan
Viersen
Virani
Wagantall
Warawa
Warkentin
Waugh
Webber
Whalen
Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould
Wong
Wrzesnewskyj
Yip
Young
Yurdiga — 251

PAIRED

Members

Duclos — Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 2 defeated.

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in and read a second time.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1555)

The Speaker: The member for Regina—Lewvan is rising on a point of order.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, in all the excitement of voting, I believe I rose twice. I just want to make sure my vote is counted in the negative.

● (1600)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 747)

YEAS

Members

Aldag — Alghabra

Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Breton
Caesar Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El Khoury
Erskine Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jowhari
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morneau
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
May (Saanich Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 168

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Angus
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (Bellechasse Les Etchemins Lévis)
Boucher
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Caron
Chong
Christopherson
Clement
Cullen
Deltell
Doherty
Dubé
Dusseault
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Généreux
Gladu
Hardcastle
Hoback
Jeneroux
Johns
Kelly
Kent
Kusie
Lake
Laverdière
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Marcil
Mathyssen
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Motz
Nater
O'Toole
Pauzé
Poilievre
Ramsey
Rayes
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Thériault
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga 125

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Block
Boudrias
Brassard
Cannings
Carrie
Choquette
Clarke
Cooper
Davies
Diotte
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Genuis
Gourde
Harder
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kmiec
Kwan
Lauzon (Stormont Dundas South Glengarry)
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong

PAIRED

Members

Duclos Gill 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of the motion that Bill C-75, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and other Acts and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment, and of the amendment to the amendment.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment to the amendment.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

[*English*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote with Liberal members voting no.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, we are in favour of apply with Conservative members voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, Québec Debout agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mr. Simon Marcil: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply the vote and we will vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and votes no.

[*English*]

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and will be voting no.

(The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 748)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Barlow
Beaulieu
Bergen
Berthold
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Boucher
Brassard
Chong
Clement
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Harder
Albas
Allison
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Block
Boudrias
Carrie
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Jeneroux
Kent
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 85
Kelly
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Maguire
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Rempel
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Van Kesteren
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Christopherson
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dubé
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Drouin
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre

Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Mathyssen	
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Monsef
Moore	Morneau
Murray	Nantel
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Pauzé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Plamondon
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rankin	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Tootoo
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 208

PAIRED

Members

Duclos	Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare the subamendment defeated.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on the amendment.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

● (1605)

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to the current vote, with the Liberal members voting no.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will vote no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, Québec Debout agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote no.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote no.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I agree to the application of the vote and vote no.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply and vote no.

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 749)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Barlow	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Brassard
Carrie	Chong
Clarke	Clement
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Finley
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Gourde	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Maguire	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nicholson
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sopuck	Sorenson
Stanton	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tilson	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa

Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 81

Waugh
Wong

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bennett
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
DeCourcey
Drouin
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dusseault
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Kang
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Moore
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Beech
Benson
Bittle
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Christopherson
Cullen
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhillon
Dubé
Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Jowhari
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef
Morneau
Nantel
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rustad
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tan
Thériault
Vandenbeld
Virani
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Ramsey
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumiy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Vaughan
Wen
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 212

PAIRED

Members

Duclos — Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1615)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 750)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bittle
Boissonnault
Bratina

Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Kang
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 173

Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jowhari
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Morneau
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumiy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Tootoo
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif — Albas
Albrecht — Allison
Angus — Barlow
Barsalou-Duval — Beaulieu
Benson — Bereen
Bergen — Bernier
Berthold — Bezan
Blaikie — Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) — Block
Boucher — Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet — Brassard
Brosseau — Cummings
Caron — Carrie
Chong — Choquette
Christopherson — Clarke
Clement — Cooper
Cullen — Davies
Dellell — Duclos
Doherty — Dreeshen
Dubé — Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault — Duvall
Eglinski — Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher) — Fast
Finley — Gallant
Garrison — Genuis
Giguère — Gill
Hardcastle — Goodridge
Hoback — Hardie
Jeneroux — Hughes
Julian — Johns
Kent — Kelly
Kmiec — Kitchen
Kuzio — Kwan
Lake — Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Laverdière — Leitch
Liepert — Lloyd
Lobb — Lukiwski
MacGregor — MacKenzie
Maguire — Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West) — Mathyssen
McCauley (Edmonton West) — McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore — Motz
Nantel — Nater
Nicholson — O'Toole
Paul-Hus — Poilievre
Quach — Ramsey
Rankin — Rayes
Reid — Rempel
Samson — Saroya
Schmale — Shields
Shipley — Sopuck
Sorenson — Stanton
Stetski — Strahl
Stubbs — Sweet
Tilson — Van Kesteren
Van Loan — Viersen
Wagantall — Warawa
Warkentin — Waugh
Webber — Wong
Wong — Yurdiga — 120

PAIRED

Members

Duclos — Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[Translation]

EXPORT AND IMPORT PERMITS ACT

The House resumed from June 8 consideration of the motion that Bill C-47, An Act to amend the Export and Import Permits Act and the Criminal Code (amendments permitting the accession to the Arms Trade Treaty and other amendments), be read the third time and passed, and of the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment of the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie to the motion for third reading of Bill C-47.

[*Chair read text of amendment to the House*]

[*English*]

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply, and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Speaker, the members of Québec Debout agree to apply the vote and will vote yes.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Erin Weir: Mr. Speaker, I agree, and vote yes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will vote yes.

[*English*]

Hon. Hunter Tootoo: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply, and will be voting no.

Mr. Darshan Singh Kang: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply, and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 751)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Beaulieu
Blaikie
Boudrias
Brosseau
Caron
Christopherson
Davies
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall
Garrison
Hardcastle
Johns
Kwan
MacGregor
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Plamondon
Ramsey
Sansoucy
Stetski
Weir — 45

Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Cannings
Choquette
Cullen
Dubé
Dusseault
Fortin
Gill
Hughes
Julian
Laverdière
Malcolmson
Mathyssen
Moore
Patzer
Quach
Rankin
Ste-Marie
Thériault

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Bergen
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Block
Bossio
Brassard
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Clement
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Doherty
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fergus
Finley
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gallant
Généreux
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Hajdu
Hardie
Hébert
Hoback
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jowhari
Kelly
Khalid
Kmiec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Levitt
Lightbound
Lobb
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Maguire
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Albas
Aldag
Alleslev
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barlow
Beech
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boissonnault
Boucher
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Clarke
Cooper
Currie
Damoff
Deltell
Diotte
Dreeshen
Dubourg
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Easter
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Garneau
Gemuis
Gladu
Goodale
Gourde
Grewal
Harder
Harvey
Hehr
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Kang
Kent
Khera
Kusie
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
LeBlanc
Lefebvre
Leslie
Liepert
Lloyd
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney

McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Monsef

(Division No. 752)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar Chavannes	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hardie	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Jowhari	Kang
Khalid	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Leslanc
Lebouthillier	Lefebvre
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Monsef	Morneau
Murray	Nassif
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Tilson
Tootoo	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Viersen
Virani	Wagantall
Wanawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Yurdiga — 248

PAIRED

Members

Duclos	Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

[*English*]

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1625)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Tassi	Tootoo
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 167	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Angus	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benson	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Brosseau	Cummings
Caron	Carrie
Chong	Choquette
Christopherson	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Cullen	Davies
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Fortin	Gallant
Garrison	Généreux
Genuis	Gill
Gladu	Gourde
Hardcastle	Harder
Hoback	Hughes
Jeneroux	Johns
Jolibois	Kelly
Kent	Kmiec
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Laverdière	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacGregor	MacKenzie
Maguire	Malcolmson
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore	Motz
Nantel	Nater
Nicholson	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Plamondon	Poilievre
Quach	Ramsey
Rankin	Rayes
Reid	Rempel
Sansoucy	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Shipley	Sopuck
Sorenson	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Strahl	Stubbs
Sweet	Thériault
Tilson	Van Kesteren
Van Loan	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Wong	Yurdiga — 126

PAIRED

Members

Duclos	Gill — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to eight petitions.

* * *

● (1630)

[*Translation*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation respecting its participation at the meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, held in Kiruna, Sweden, from May 13 to 14, 2018.

[*English*]

Just so members know, the eight Arctic nations meet four times a year. I am the vice-chair. If members have any input with respect to the Arctic nations co-operation, I would ask that they contact me.

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian delegation of the Canada-United Kingdom Interparliamentary Association respecting its bilateral visit to London, England, and Belfast, Northern Island, United Kingdom, and Dublin, Ireland, from March 5 to March 9, 2018.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Bryan May (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 10th report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of People with Disabilities, entitled "Main Estimates 2018-19: Vote 1 under Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Vote 1 under Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety and Votes 1 and 5 under Department of Employment and Social Development".

While I am on my feet, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities in relation to Bill C-62, an act to amend the Federal Public Sector Labour Relations Act and other acts.

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House without amendment.

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two items to present today.

First, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 14th report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans entitled, ""Healthy Oceans, Vibrant Coastal Communities: Strengthening The Oceans Act's Marine Protected Areas Establishment Process".

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say a few words about our supplementary report.

Canada has the largest, most geographically diverse coastline in the world. Applying a one-size-fits-all comparison to what other countries are doing or experiencing with respect to marine protected areas would prove problematic and ill-advised. A rush to expediently designate interim MPAs to capitalize politically on the international stage does not take into consideration those isolated communities along our coast.

Time and again we heard from witnesses who were not consulted by the Liberal government. By refusing to listen to stakeholders and by accelerating the process of creating MPAs, the Liberal government has replaced established processes for building consensus with expediency, serving a partisan interest.

Truly sustainable MPAs require a delicate balance upholding principles of conservation, indigenous rights, common resource, and the interest of all Canadians both today and in the future.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second report I wish to present to the House, in both official languages, is the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans entitled, "Main Estimates 2018-19: Votes 1, 5 and 10 under Department of Fisheries and Oceans".

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by literally hundreds of folks in my riding and other parts of Southwestern Ontario.

Amongst other things, the petitioners say the Government of Canada must defend the rights of all Canadians regardless of whether the current Liberal government agrees with specific views held by individual Canadians. The petitioners believe the current Liberal government's proposed attestation requiring the summer jobs program to hold the same views as the government would contravene the Canadian Charter of Rights.

Therefor, the petitioners call upon the Prime Minister to defend their freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief and withdraw the attestation requirements for applicants for the Canada summer jobs program.

● (1635)

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to present a number of petitions from people in my riding and adjacent ridings that support the truth and reconciliation of aboriginal peoples of Canada.

The petitioners draw the House's attention to the fact that the Canadian government declared the Sinixt tribal group extinct in 1956. Among other things, the petitioners also point out that the Sinixt peoples have never in fact ceased to exist as a tribal group.

Therefor, the petitioners call upon Parliament to reverse the wrongful declaration of the extinction of the Sinixt tribal group and take immediate steps to recognize the Sinixt as an autonomous tribal group within its traditional and ancestral Canadian territory.

FILIPINO HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have here a petition from the Seniors of the West Island and Suburbs. It is a Filipino association, commonly known as SWIS, run by Mr. Roger Ajero. It provides all kinds of senior activities, line dancing, bingo, excursions, and they are not just for Filipino seniors. They also invite all kinds of people. My good friend, Benny Bote, is always there with a smile to welcome them. They prepared this petition asking for the Government of Canada to recognize the month of June as Filipino heritage month. I am very proud to present this petition to the House on their behalf.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Madam Speaker, section 2 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms identifies, among other things, freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and freedom of belief as fundamental freedoms. The Government of Canada must defend these rights of all Canadians, regardless of whether the Liberal government agrees with specific views held by individual Canadians. We believe the current government's proposed attestation requiring Canada summer jobs program applicants to hold the same views as the government would contravene the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Therefore, these hundreds of petitioners call upon the Prime Minister to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief and withdraw the attestation requirement for applicants to the Canada summer jobs program.

KILLER WHALES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to present a petition from residents of Saanich—Gulf Islands speaking to the high degree of endangerment of the southern resident killer whale population. This population of orcas is listed as highly endangered under the United States endangered species law, as well as under the Canadian Species at Risk Act. The petitioners ask that there be immediate action to limit acoustic and physical disturbances in the critical habitat of the southern resident killer whale by increasing vessel approach distances to 200 metres from the current 100 metres and taking other measures to keep this species from going extinct.

VISAS

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a petition to table, primarily from residents in Ontario. They are calling on the government, particularly the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, to make the Canadian High Commission in Islamabad fully operational so that it could grant spousal, student, and visitor visas without any discrimination. In particular, they note the travel advisory imposed in 2017 and that security and political conditions have improved. They note also family class immigration. The Canadian High Commission in Islamabad is not fully operational. Therefore, all processes are being handled in New Delhi, Dubai, and the United Kingdom.

On spousal visas, the processing of spousal visas in other countries is three to five months while processing for Pakistan is still 20 to 35 months. On the issue of student visas, the petitioners note that hardly any student visas get approval from Pakistan as compared to other countries in the region. Finally, on the issue of visitor visas, it is very hard to get visitor visas from Pakistan, despite having the applicant fulfill complete requirements, including letters from elected officials and declarations that the visitor would not likely stay longer in Canada.

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Brome—Missisquoi region has magnificent natural and inhabited landscapes. The beauty of the Appalachian peaks in Brome—Missisquoi provides unique tourism opportunities.

The petitioners are calling on the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to help them create a national inhabited park to protect and showcase Brome-Missisquoi's natural surroundings and provide an iconic regional legacy.

● (1640)

[*English*]

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to present a petition from constituents who live in Rockwood, in Wellington County. They are calling on the government to change the Canada summer jobs program to remove the discriminatory requirement to attest to certain beliefs.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am tabling two petitions today.

The first one is e-petition 1465 signed by almost 3,000 people. Basically, these are people from my riding of Kootenay—Columbia who are concerned that when parties and politicians are running for office, they have one set of promises and, ultimately, do not deliver on all of them. Therefore, the petitioners are asking that the House of Commons develop recall legislation to hold all of us accountable for the promises we make during elections.

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP): Madam Speaker, my second petition, with 36 signatures, is aimed at all of the G7 nations, or G6 plus one these days. They are concerned that girls and women in the world's poorest countries are being held back from realizing their full potential. They would like to close gender gaps around the world as 132 million girls do not have access to primary or secondary education. They are asking that the Government of Canada and all G7 nations invest in girls and women in the world's poorest countries.

THE ECONOMY

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions. The first is from a group of Canadians who wish the Government of Canada to address the affordability crisis in this country, and to build a fair economy that will lift everyone up, not just a few at the top.

The petitioners are calling on the government to consider Canadians who are struggling every day with the challenges of unaffordable housing, child care, precarious and unreliable work, in addition to the shrinking opportunities faced by these folks. Household debt is at a historic high.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to invest in affordable housing, really invest in it, not pretend to invest in it, take concrete measures to address out-of-control housing markets, protect good-paying jobs, and take action to make sure that the wealthy and most profitable corporations pay their fair share.

CANADA POST

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, my second petition is in support of postal banking.

Nearly two million Canadians desperately need an alternative to predatory payday lenders who charge crippling interest rates, affecting the most marginalized, poor, rural, and indigenous communities in Canada. We have 3,800 Canada Post outlets that already exist in rural areas, where there are fewer or no banks or credit unions. Canada Post has the infrastructure to make a rapid transition to include postal banking.

The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to enact Motion No. 166 to create a committee to study and propose a plan, so that we have postal banking under the Canada Post Corporation.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to table a petition on behalf of residents of Tofino, Ucluelet, and Ahousaht.

The petitioners are calling on the government to adopt Motion No. 151 to establish a bold national strategy to combat plastic pollution. They are calling on the government to work with provinces, municipalities, and indigenous communities to develop the strategy, with regulations aimed at reducing plastic debris discharged from stormwater outfalls, industrial use of microplastics, consumer and industrial use of single-use plastics; and permanent, dedicated annual funding for a cleanup of derelict fishing gear, and community-led projects to clean up plastics and debris from our shores; and education and outreach campaigns directed at the root causes and negative environmental effects of plastic pollution in and around all bodies of water.

FALUN GONG

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I stand in the House on behalf of thousands of citizens who have signed a petition calling on the Canadian government to request that Chinese officials immediately end the persecution of Falun Gong, and release all Falun Gong prisoners of conscience, including Canadian citizens, Ms. Qian Sun and Ms. Aiyun He.

They are also requesting the government take every opportunity to establish measures to investigate the Chinese regime's alleged organ harvesting of innocent people for their organs in China.

● (1645)

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, large commercial freighters anchored for long duration and in close proximity to residential and recreational areas can disturb a community's quality of life, enjoyment of property, and public space, say the petitioners from Saltair and Ladysmith in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Three large commercial bulk anchorages were established in the 1970s, but they have not been used since. The Minister of Transport established a pilot project, an interim protocol to redistribute anchorages throughout the Salish Sea, because there is so much heavy use. Basically, freighters are dropping anchor and staying for weeks on end. The light, noise, and oil spill risk is a detriment to the high reliance of this community on ecotourism and on a clean environment.

The petitioners urge the House of Commons to call upon the Government of Canada to protect Saltair's rural and coastal community character, and exclude the historical anchorages, LSC, LSD, and LSE, from the interim protocol for use of southern Gulf Islands' anchorages.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1703 and 1715.

[*Text*]

Question No. 1703—**Mr. Pierre Poilievre**:

With regard to the Canada Infrastructure Bank: what is the value of the Bank's assets, broken down by asset class?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.) Mr. Speaker, the Canada Infrastructure Bank had an estimated $9,882,852 in total assets as at March 31, 2018, unaudited. This is broken down as follows. In cash and cash equivalents, the bank had $9,865,126. In property and equipment, including computer and telecommunications equipment, furniture, fixtures, and equipment, the bank had $17,726.

The Canada Infrastructure Bank's fiscal year-end is March 31 and information is provided to March 31, 2018. Information to April 24, 2018 is not currently available.

Question No. 1715—**Mr. John Nater**:

With regard to designations of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law: who has been conferred a Queen's Counsel designation since November 4, 2015?

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth), Lib.) Mr. Speaker, with regard to designations of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law, one person has been conferred the Queen's Counsel designation since November 4, 2015: the Honourable Jody Wilson Raybould, as per Order in Council P.C. 2016-29 of January 26, 2016.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if revised response to Question No. 1666, originally tabled on June 1, 2018, and the government's responses to Questions Nos. 1691 to 1702, 1704 to 1714, and 1716 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 1666— **Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy**:

With regard to federal spending in the constituency of Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot in the fiscal year 2017-2018: what grants, loans, contributions and contracts were awarded by the government, broken down by (i) department and agency, (ii) municipality, (iii) name of recipient, (iv) amount received, (v) program under which expenditure was allocated, (vi) date?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1691—**Mr. Dan Albas**:

With regard to the effect of the carbon tax on low-income Canadians: (*a*) has the government conducted any studies regarding the impact of a $50 per tonne carbon tax on low income Canadians and specifically on the impact of increased food prices resulting from higher transportation costs; and (*b*) if the answer to (*a*) is affirmative, what are the details of all such studies, including (i) individuals who or entities which conducted the study, (ii) description of parameters and methodology, (iii) findings, (iv) start and end dates of study, (v) website location where findings were published?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1692—**Mrs. Karen Vecchio**:

With regard to spending to assist veterans in the last and current fiscal year, broken down by year: (*a*) what is the total government spending on programming and transfers specifically related to this issue, broken down by each specific funding envelope and each program funded; and (*b*) what portion of this funding is committed to (i) front-line services, (ii) medical services, (iii) psychological and mental health services, (iv) commemoration events, (v) public awareness and education campaigns, (vi) direct payments to veterans, (vii) other commitments, broken down by type of commitment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1693— **Mrs. Karen Vecchio**:

With regard to spending aimed at providing services to Canadians with disabilities for the last and current fiscal year, broken down by year: (*a*) what is the total government spending on programming and transfers specifically related to this issue, broken down by each specific funding envelope and each program funded; and (*b*) what portion of this funding is committed to (i) improving accessibility, (ii) research and studies, (iii) grants and contributions to non-governmental organizations, (iv) transfers to other levels of governments, (v) educational services for individuals with disabilities, (vi) public education efforts, (vii) other services for individuals with disabilities, (viii) other commitments, broken down by type of commitment?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1694— **Mr. Alexandre Boulerice**:

With regard to all types of subsidies and all types of loans to the gas, oil and coal industry: (*a*) what was the dollar value of the grants provided to natural gas, oil and coal industry companies, in Canada and abroad, between 2015 and 2018 inclusive, broken down by (i) year, (ii) type of industry (oil, gas, coal), (iii) company name, (iv) amount provided; (*b*) what was the dollar value of the loans provided to natural gas, oil and coal industry companies, in Canada and abroad, between 2015 and 2018 inclusive, broken down by (i) year, (ii) type of industry (oil, gas, coal), (iii) company name, (iv) amount provided; (*c*) what was the dollar value of the tax relief provided to natural gas, oil and coal industry companies, in Canada and abroad, between 2011 and 2018 inclusive, broken down by (i) year, (ii) type of tax relief used, (iii) type of industry (oil, gas, coal), (iv) dollar value of the tax relief; and (*d*) according to the government's estimates, when does it expect to completely eliminate subsidies for fossil fuels such as natural gas, oil and coal, in Canada and abroad?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1695—**Mr. Robert Aubin**:

With regard to Employment Insurance (EI) between 2015 and 2017 in the EI economic region of Trois-Rivières, in total and broken down by year and by month: (*a*) what was the number of EI claims; (*b*) what was the number of claims accepted and the number of claims rejected; (*c*) what was the average EI claim processing time; (*d*) how many claims waited more than 28 days for a decision; (*e*) what was the average wait time for a decision in (*d*); (*f*) what was the volume of calls to EI call centres; (*g*) what was the number of calls to EI call centres that received a high volume message; (*h*) what were the national service level standards for calls answered by an agent at EI call centres; (*i*) what were the actual service level standards achieved by EI call centres for calls answered by an agent; (*j*) what were the service standards for call-backs from EI processing staff; (*k*) what were the service standards achieved by EI processing staff for call-backs; (*l*) what was the average number of days for a call-back by EI processing staff; (*m*) what was the number and percentage of term employees and the number and percentage of indeterminate employees, working at EI call centres and processing centres; (*n*) what was the rate of sick-leave use among EI call centre and processing centre employees; (*o*) what was the number of EI call centre and processing centre employees on long-term disability; (*p*) what was the number of overtime hours worked by call centre employees; (*q*) how many complaints did the Office of Client Satisfaction receive, broken down by region and province where the complaint originated; (*r*) how long on average did a complaint take to be investigated and resolved; and (*s*) what were the major themes of the complaints received?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1696— **Mr. Robert Aubin**:

With regard to the investment of $3.3 million announced in Budget 2016 to support an in-depth assessment of VIA Rail's high-frequency rail proposal and the additional investment of $8 million announced in Budget 2018 to support the continued in-depth assessment of VIA Rail's high-frequency rail (HFR) proposal for the Quebec City-Windsor corridor: (*a*) how much of the $3.3 million and $8 million have been spent to date, broken down by (i) feasibility studies, (ii) contractors; (*b*) how many employees are assigned to the assessment; (*c*) has VIA Rail provided the government with studies on the high-frequency rail proposal; (*d*) if the answer in (*c*) is affirmative, will Transport Canada publish the entirety of these studies and their findings on its website; (*e*) how many studies and assessments have been conducted on this subject by Transport Canada to date and, if applicable, (i) what were the findings of each of these studies, (ii) will the entirety of these studies and their findings be published on Transport Canada's website, (iii) what was the cost of each of these studies; (iv) when did Transport Canada conduct each of these studies; (*f*) why were the findings of the $3.3 million first phase of the assessment insufficient to approve funding for HFR; and (*g*) what data were missing from the $3.3 million first phase of the assessment that were required in order to fund HFR?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1697—**Mr. Robert Aubin**:

With regard to federal spending in the riding of Trois-Rivières, for each fiscal year since 2015-16, inclusively: what are the details of all grants and contributions and all loans to every organization, group, business or municipality, broken down by the (i) name of the recipient, (ii) municipality of the recipient, (iii) date on which the funding was received, (iv) amount received, (v) department or agency that provided the funding, (vi) program under which the grant, contribution or loan was made, (vii) nature or purpose?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1698— **Mr. Robert Aubin**:

With regard to the monitoring of the safety management systems of federally regulated railway companies and rail safety between 2006 and 2017, broken down by year: (*a*) what is the total number of audits completed; (*b*) what is the target number of audits required by the Transport Canada policy; (*c*) how many non-federally-regulated railway companies were targeted by the audits; (*d*) what is the number of inspectors qualified to conduct the audits; (*e*) what is the number of managers and inspectors who have completed the course on the audit approach; (*f*) what was the deficiency rate across the federally regulated rail industry; (*g*) how many times did inspectors encourage voluntary compliance; (*h*) how many letters of safety concern, letters of non-compliance, notices or notices and orders as interim measures to reduce threats or immediate threats to safe railway operations were issued by inspectors; (*i*) how many prosecutions for serious violations have inspectors participated in; (*j*) how many letters of warning were issued by inspectors; (*k*) how many notices or notices and orders were issued by inspectors to local railway companies; (*l*) how many notices or notices and orders were issued to federally regulated railway companies; (*m*) how many local railway companies failed to comply with a notice; (*n*) how many federally regulated railway companies failed to comply with a notice; (*o*) how many exemptions from the application of regulations were accepted by Transport Canada for local railway companies; (*p*) how many threats under the Rail Safety Act were identified by inspectors; (*q*) how many serious threats under the Rail Safety Act were identified by inspectors; (*r*) how many in-service rail failures were identified by inspectors; (*s*) how many in-service joint pull aparts were identified by inspectors; (*t*) how many broken or cracked wheels found on a train in a yard or in a repair facility were identified by inspectors; (*u*) how many deviations from the defective rail standards in the Rules Respecting Track Safety were identified using rail flaw testing activities; and (*v*) what is the average number of inspectors assigned to the monitoring and inspection of each tank car?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1699— **Mr. Blake Richards**:

With regard to registered charities that indirectly fund Canadian political activity or campaigns through foreign or third party entities: what specific action to stop such funding is being taken by (i) the Canada Revenue Agency, (ii) Elections Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1700— **Mr.Tom Lukiwski**:

With regard to the invitation extended to Vikram Vij to travel to India in relation to the Prime Minister's trip in February 2018: (*a*) on what date did the government invite Mr. Vij to travel to India as part of the Prime Minister's trip; (*b*) what were the start and end dates of Mr. Vij's term on the Independent Advisory Board for Senate Appointments; and (*c*) was Mr. Vij a member of the Independent Advisory Board for Senate Appointments when the government invited him to be a part of the Prime Minister's trip to India?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1701—**Mr. Tom Lukiwski**:

With regard to interactions between the government and Canada 2020, since November 4, 2015: (*a*) has anyone from the government advised or recommended that any individual or corporation attend a Canada 2020 event; and (*b*) if the answer to (*a*) is affirmative, what are the details of all such interactions, including (i) individual providing advice or recommendation, (ii) recipient, (iii) date and title of related Canada 2020 event?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1702— **Mr. Daniel Blaikie**:

With regard to the Main Estimates 2018-19: of the $82.29 billion for operating and capital expenditures (including the Treasury Board Budget Implementation vote), how much comes from statutory authorities and how much is dependent upon voted authorities?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1704—**Mr. James Bezan**:

With regard to the government's decision to deploy Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) equipment and personnel to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali: (*a*) how many CAF personnel will be deployed to the mission, (i) what unit do these personnel belong to, (ii) what trade do these personnel belong to in the CAF; (*b*) what CAF assets will be deployed to the mission; (*c*) what is the estimated cost of the mission; (*d*) what is the duration of Canada's military commitment to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali; (*e*) will CAF personnel or assets be assisting in G5 Sahel operations within Mali; (*f*) will CAF personnel or equipment assist in counter-terrorism operations while in Mali; and (*g*) will Canadian personnel deployed to the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali ever be in the position to receive orders from individuals outside the CAF chain of command?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1705— **Mr. Richard Cannings**:

With regard to the approval of the Trans Mountain Pipeline Project and the work of the Ministerial Review Panel appointed by the government in this matter: (*a*) can construction of a new Trans Mountain Pipeline be reconciled with Canada's climate change commitments; (*b*) in the absence of a comprehensive national energy strategy, how can policy-makers effectively assess projects such as the Trans Mountain Pipeline; (*c*) how might Cabinet square approval of the Trans Mountain Pipeline with its commitment to reconciliation with First Nations and to the UNDRIP principles of "free, prior, and informed consent"; (*d*) given the changed economic and political circumstances, the perceived flaws in the National Energy Board process, and also the criticism of the Ministerial Panel's own review, how can Canada be confident in its assessment of the project's economic rewards and risks; (*e*) if approved, what route would best serve aquifer, municipal, aquatic and marine safety; and (*f*) how does federal policy define the terms "social licence" and "Canadian public interest" and their inter-relationships?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1706—**Mr. Larry Maguire**:

With regard to authorizations to transport firearms issued in each province and territory by Chief Firearms Officers, for the last ten years, broken down by year: (*a*) how many authorizations to transport were (i) issued, (ii) refused, (iii) revoked, (iv) resulted in criminal charges, (v) resulted in firearms licenses being revoked, (vi) resulted in firearms being seized; and (*b*) how many full time equivalents were involved in the processing, administration and enforcement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1707—**Mr. Larry Maguire**:

With regard to statistics on firearms seized by police for the last five years, broken down by province or territory: (*a*) what was the total number of firearms seized, broken down by classification (non-restricted, restricted, prohibited); (*b*) of the firearms in (*a*), how many were identified as used in the commission of an indictable offence, broken down by classification; (*c*) for the firearms in (*a*) and (*b*), how many were (i) registered, (ii) unregistered, (iii) domestically sourced, (iv) smuggled into Canada, (v) located and identified using the Canadian Firearms Information System (CFIS), (vi) traced to their source by the Canadian National Firearms Tracing Centre (CNFTC); (*d*) of the number of firearms identified in (*a*), how many were seized from a licenced firearms owner; and (*e*) of the number of licenced firearms owners identified in (*b*), how many were (i) charged with the indictable offence for which the firearm was used, (ii) charged with providing a firearm to the persons charged with the indictable offence for which the firearm was used, (iii) charged with 'careless storage' of their firearm after having their firearm stolen from them?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1708—**Mr. Larry Maguire**:

With regard to firearms licences issued in each province and territory for the last ten years, broken down by year: (*a*) how many Possession and Acquisition Licences (PAL) were (i) issued, (ii) revoked by reason for revocation; (*b*) how many Restricted Possession and Acquisition Licences (RPAL) were (i) issued, (ii) revoked by reason for revocation; (*c*) what is the average time for government or police to confiscate revoked firearms licences for (i) PAL, (ii) RPAL; and (*d*) what is the average time for government or police to confiscate the firearms possessed by revoked firearms licence holders for (i) PAL, (ii) RPAL?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1709— **Mr. Pat Kelly**:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency's (CRA) practice of withholding transfer or benefit payments from the Government of Canada or provincial or territorial governments to taxpayers who owe taxes payable (tax debts), and instead applying the balances of such payments to such tax debts: (*a*) for 2016, 2017, and 2018, broken down by year, how many federal transfer or benefit payments were applied to tax debts; (*b*) for each year in (*a*), how many provincial or territorial transfer or benefit payments were applied to tax debts; (*c*) which federal transfer or benefit payments may CRA withhold and apply to tax debts; (*d*) which provincial or territorial transfer or benefit payments may CRA withhold and apply to tax debts; (*e*) which, if any, federal or provincial or territorial transfer or benefit payments are exempt from withholding and application to tax debt; (*f*) for each year in (*a*) what total amount of overall transfer or benefit payments did CRA withhold and apply to tax debts; (*g*) for each year in (*a*), how many transfer or benefit payments did CRA withhold and apply to tax debts before the deadline for paying taxes owing; (*h*) is the practice in (*g*) of withholding and applying transfer or benefit payments to tax debts before the deadline for paying taxes owing legal; (*i*) if the practice in (*g*) of withholding and applying transfer or benefit payments to tax debts before the deadline for paying taxes owing is legal, which section of which statute permits it; (*j*) for each year in (*a*) in which CRA withheld and applied transfer or benefit payments to tax debts before the deadline for paying taxes owing, how many tax debts to which such payments were applied did taxpayers pay in full by or on the deadline, such that an overpayment resulted; (*k*) for each year in (*a*), how many overpayments in (*j*) did CRA refund to the applicable taxpayers; and (*l*) for each year in (*a*), how many transfer or benefit payments which CRA withheld and applied to a tax debt which resulted in an overpayment in (*j*) did CRA retain to apply to taxes owing in the future?

(Return tabled)

Point of Order

Question No. 1710— **Mr. Pat Kelly**:

With regard to the testimony at the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance on March 1, 2018, by the Assistant Commissioner, International, Large Business and Investigations Branch of the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), regarding monetary incentives and debt collection at the CRA: (*a*) what percentage and what absolute value of assessed taxes, including personal, corporate, and excise taxes, did CRA not collect between 2007 and 2017 inclusively, broken down by year; (*b*) of the taxes owing but not collected in (*a*), what percentage of debts (i) were collected in the following year, (ii) were collected within two years, (iii) were collected within five years, (iv) were collected after five years, (v) have not been collected to date; (*c*) what options or authorized measures can CRA deploy to recover tax debts; (*d*) of the debts in (*a*) which were eventually collected, what percentage were recovered by each of the measures in (*c*), broken down by year; (*e*) by what criteria are CRA employees evaluated with respect to success or failure to collect debts owing; (*f*) for auditors, assessors, and collectors at CRA, what performance metrics are considered for employee evaluations and how are they ranked or weighted; (*g*) on what evidence is the audit change rate of 75% based; (*h*) what is the acceptable error rate for audits and assessments respectively; (*i*) what measures exist at CRA to reduce the error rate of individual auditors and assessors; and (*j*) what protocols exist at CRA to correct errors made by auditors or assessors before objections or appeals are filed by affected taxpayers?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1711— **Mrs. Cathay Wagantall**:

With regard to materials prepared for Associate Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers from December 1, 2017, to present: for every briefing document prepared, what is the (i) date on the document, (ii) title or subject matter of the document, (iii) department's internal tracking number, (iv) title of individual for whom the material was prepared, (v) sender?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1712—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall**:

With regard to materials prepared for Deputy Ministers from December 1, 2017, to present: for every briefing document prepared, what is the (i) date on the document, (ii) title or subject matter of the document, (iii) department's internal tracking number, (iv) sender?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1713—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall**:

With regard to all expenditures on hospitality (Treasury Board Object Code 0822), since December 6, 2017, and broken down by department or agency: what are the details of all expenditures, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of expenditure, (iv) start and end date of contract, (v) description of goods or services provided, (vi) file number, (vii) number of government employees in attendance, (viii) number of other attendees?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1714—**Mrs. Cathay Wagantall**:

With regard to materials prepared for Ministers from December 6, 2017, to present: for every briefing document prepared, what is the (i) date on the document, (ii) title or subject matter of the document, (iii) department's internal tracking number, (iv) sender?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1716— **Mr. Dane Lloyd**:

With regard to overtime pay for departmental communications staff since January 1, 2016, broken down by year: what is the total cost of this overtime, broken down by (i) department, agency, or other government entity, (ii) individual communication staff title?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

STANDING ORDER 69.1—BILL C-59

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will try to be brief out of respect for our Conservative colleagues because today is their opposition day. I am taking this opportunity because of the vote that took place earlier today to adopt Bill C-59 at second reading and report stage.

I will quote what the Chair said in response to a point of order I raised a while ago about applying Standing Order 69.1 to this bill.

[*English*]

The Speaker said:

However should the motion in fact be adopted to send the bill to committee before second reading and should the bill be concurred in at report stage and at second reading, I could certainly, as the Speaker, apply Standing Order 69.1 at third reading of the bill. At that time, one would anticipate that after it came back from committee, the bounds of the bill and its principles would be more clearly established.

For that reason, I come back with the same point of order. I would simply refer the Chair to the statements I made on November 20, 2017 to the record of that day. I made the same points. I would only add that the point is even more strongly made following the committee process. As we went clause by clause, different officials from different departments had to be present on different days as we went through different elements. That only reinforces the fact that not only under this legislation, but also where there are disparate pieces that obviously pertained to different acts in different departments, so they would be deserving of different votes.

[*Translation*]

I hope the Speaker will agree that there should be separate votes because there truly are different elements, especially concerning the Communications Security Establishment, which reports to the Minister of National Defence. The minister had to sneak into the committee at 10 to midnight to make a presentation. I think even the government acknowledges that some elements are in no way related except for some vague national security connection, which I feel is not a good enough reason for Standing Order 69.1 not to apply.

● (1650)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I appreciate the member's comments. We will certainly consider the information he just provided us and other information and deliberate on the matter. We will come back as needed.

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona, International Trade; the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, The Environment; the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Foreign Affairs.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—IRAN

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to finish my presentation on today's motion, which seeks to strongly condemn the current regime in Iran and more specifically a terrorist state.

It is often said that you have to turn on to politics, or politics will turn on you. The same can be said of terrorism. Unfortunately, yesterday we saw hate speech come out of the demonstrations that were held in a number of our major cities. It was an incitement to violence.

In Canada, we have freedom of expression, but sections 318 and 319 of the Criminal Code also state that promoting the genocide of or inciting hatred against an identifiable group is completely inconsistent with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Criminal Code. Unfortunately, that is what we saw yesterday when demonstrators called for the destruction of a democratic country in the Middle East, Israel, and its people.

I am raising this topic in debate because yesterday was the international al-Quds day, which was established in 1979 by Ayatollah Khomeini, an Iranian dictator. The purpose of this event, which originated in Iran but is financed in several western countries, including, unfortunately, Canada, is clearly to destroy a democratic country.

This is why it is important for every member of this House to take a strong stand and support the motion to strongly condemn terrorism and those who support it.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to ask my colleague for his thoughts about a comparison. There has been a lot of discussion today about the question of diplomatic relations and when it is appropriate to downgrade our diplomatic relationship with another country. The current government, though, has downgraded our relationship with other countries in response to human rights abuses. In one case, we wish the government would be more vocal on these issues, but in the case of Venezuela, the government did announce that it was downgrading its diplomatic ties with the country in response to some of the very serious human rights violations happening there, including saying that Canada's embassy there will only be headed by a chargé d'affaires rather than an ambassador.

It is interesting that we have the government on the one hand seemingly open to upgrading our diplomatic relationship with Iran, at least based on some of the comments we have heard today about the language in this motion, but then clearly understanding, in the case of Venezuela, that it is sensible to downgrade the relationship, or at least not to upgrade it, when there are terrible violations of human rights. I wonder if my colleague has comments on this comparison, and why this illustrates further that we should not be moving forward in a way that the government has in the past talked about, in terms of warming up relations with Iran.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his thoughtful comments and for standing up for human rights. Canada must not ignore Iran's abuses, but unfortunately, the Liberal government seems to be numb to these abuses. We saw this during question period.

It is completely unacceptable for the organizations involved in yesterday's protests to promote hatred against the state of Israel to receive subsidies from the Liberal government. There is a real disconnect between their speech and reality.

I hope that members will support this motion, denounce terrorism, and walk the talk. Canadians must no longer indirectly finance organizations that promote terrorism here or abroad.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, New Democrats believe that we should be talking to the people in countries we may not agree with. That is the only pathway to peace. When the Conservatives closed their embassy in Iran, it left Canada in a position, when we had consular cases, where we had nowhere to go. In fact, we have to use our agents in Italy or Jordan if we have a consular file in Iran, or the special interest section in Washington. We need to have clear communication directly with Iran when it comes to consular files. It would be like asking for the government to consider closing the Canadian embassy in the Philippines, or China or Egypt or Saudi Arabia, because we do not agree with their policies. We know that is not going to help us. Especially for Canadians abroad when they are in trouble, consular services are critical. We have seen that it hurts our ability to provide consular services to Canadians in Iran, certainly with Homa Hoodfar and other files that we have seen. How does the member expect that we are supposed to deliver consular files to people in Iran or other countries where we do not have diplomatic relations?

● (1655)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague appears to have a short memory. We must remember that the Iranian regime has threatened the lives of diplomats. Canada played a pivotal role at that time.

Our top priority is to protect our own diplomats and Canadians. That is the government's number one responsibility. It is also extremely important not to sanction regimes that endorse brutality and terrorize their own people.

I would advise my colleague to put the safety of our diplomats first. When we send our people to another country, we must ensure they are safe and that the country in question respects human rights.

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Levitt (York Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country.

I am thankful for the opportunity to contribute to this debate, and I am pleased to support this motion.

I want to begin by unequivocally condemning the Iranian regime. I condemn it for its incitement and its threats against Israel. I condemn it for its sponsorship and export of terror, for its support of Hamas and incitement of violence in Gaza, for its destabilizing efforts across the Middle East, for its egregious strike violations against the Iranian people, and for its imprisonment and murder of Canadians.

We need to distinguish that we are not condemning the Iranian people, but the theocratic, authoritarian regime under Ayotallah Khamenei. The Iranian people are the greatest victims of this regime and have their most basic rights and freedoms and aspirations crushed every day.

To start, I want to focus on Iran's clear call for Israel's destruction. Just last week, Iran's leader, Ayotallah Khamanei, called Israel a "malignant, cancerous tumor" that had to be eradicated. This is not a new position. Iran spreads this message around the world.

In Toronto, and across Canada, we experience annual al-Quds day rallies where demonstrators call for the destruction of Israel with blatant anti-Semitic incitement and hate directed toward Jews and Israel. These rallies were first initiated in the wake of a 1979 revolution, and are promoted internationally by Iran. I might add that this rally just took place this past Saturday in Toronto, and all of the things that I have just mentioned were on display.

Ayotallah Khamenei even stated that the mission of al-Quds day was to oppose "the danger posed by the usurper Israel". This statement is not just hate, which it clearly is. This is a call to destroy the Jewish state. As the terrorist groups Iran funds say, they want to "drive Jews into the sea".

This brings me to a point on the recent violence on the Israel-Gaza border. It is clear the terrorist organization Hamas, bears direct moral responsibility and culpability for the unfortunate loss of life. However, what many people tend to overlook is the role Iran plays as a destabilizing force in the region, in particular as a supply of weapons and money to the terrorist groups that threaten and attack Israelis on a near daily basis.

The rockets that Hamas indiscriminately fires into Israel, which is a war crime, are supplied by Iran. The rockets that the terrorist group Hezbollah fired into Israel during the 2008 war, and which it continues to stockpile today to threaten Israelis, those are supplied by Iran.

It is important to note that Canada has designated Hamas, in addition to the groups Islamic Jihad and Hezbollah, as terrorist organizations since 2002. This is a position that the government continues to hold. We strongly condemn Iran's culture of violence, its threats toward Israel, and its acts of terrorism.

I also want to acknowledge and thank the Prime Minister for his support of Israelis during this difficult time. He clearly stated, "Israel has every right to defend itself against these deplorable attacks by the terrorist groups Hamas and Islamic Jihad." It is important to note that Iran is not just exporting terror to Israel. It is spreading it across the Middle East and around the world. Iran is an active belligerent in the Syrian civil war. It wholeheartedly supports its client, the Assad regime, and the brutal repression of the Syrian people.

In particular, the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and Quds Force, the first sanctioned under our Special Economic Measures Act, and the second listed as a terrorist organization in Canada, have caused immense suffering for millions of people.

In Yemen, Iran actively supports and supplies Houthi rebels with weapons, encouraging and enabling them to continue the bloody civil war under which millions of Yemeni suffer horribly.

● (1700)

Iran even exports its domestic repression. Under Iran's direction, the leader of the Houthis in Yemen has begun to publicly incite hatred against the Baha'i, a pacifist religious minority that are brutally repressed in Iran. A prominent Houthis strategist even tweeted that "We will butcher every Baha'i." However, I have not even gotten to the regime's abuses in Iran domestically.

At the subcommittee on international human rights, we hold an annual Iran Accountability Week, and every year we hear of the constant and worsening human rights abuses.

Last December, over 3,700 Iranian demonstrators, calling for their democratic rights, were arrested, including women and girls calling for equal rights. Those protesters have become subject to Iran's vindictive judicial system, which includes the notorious Evin Prison where Canadian citizen, Dr. Kavous Seyed-Emami died in February, which the regime boldly claimed was a suicide. His wife, Canadian citizen Maryam Mombeini, remains in Iran against her will.

I am proud of the foreign affairs minister's determination to bring Ms. Mombeini home to her two sons. As the minister told the foreign affairs committee just last week, any contact that Canada has with Iran is focused on Ms. Mombeini and bringing her back to Canada. This is a principled position that all Canadians should support. We cannot tolerate the death of a Canadian in an Iranian prison, and we cannot tolerate the Iranian regime effectively taking a Canadian hostage and refusing to let her return to Canada.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs has been unwavering in defending Canadians, and I support her wholeheartedly.

There is no discussion with Iran outside of returning Ms. Mombeini. There is no resumption of diplomatic relations. Iran must allow Maryam Mombeini to come home, and must do it immediately.

This is not the first case like this. Canadian permanent resident, Saeed Malekpour, has been imprisoned since 2008; the tragic case of Zahra Kazemi, the Canadian journalist who was murdered by torture in Evin prison; and of course Homa Hoodfar, who was, thankfully, released alive.

What is clear in all of these cases is that the criminalization of descent in Iran has intensified and the persistent oppression of minority communities, including members of Iran's LGBTQ community and Iranian women, continues unabated. Iranian citizens exercising their rights of freedom of thought, conscience, and expression, as well as their freedom of assembly, face arbitrary detention, ill treatment, or much worse.

State-sanctioned discrimination against women and girls, ethnic and religious minorities, like the Baha'i, and human rights defenders continues unabated, and unencumbered by due process or any concept of fundamental principles of justice or the rule of law.

The Canadian government continues to hold the Iranian regime to account for its ongoing aggression and incitement by continuing to list Iran as a state sponsor of terror for the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act. Canada also continues to have one of the strongest sanctions regimes to hold the Iranian regime to account.

Canada has and continues to be one of the strongest critics of Iran's atrocious human rights record. Since 2003, Canada has been the lead sponsor of the annual UN resolution on the situation of human rights in Iran, a tradition this government has proudly maintained.

Last, I want to reaffirm the point that we in Canada are a friend of the Iranian people and support them in their aspirations for a free and democratic Iran. Iranians are the regime's fist victim and deserve our support and solidarity.

I am proud to join our government in supporting this motion. I join the government in condemning the Iranian regime's unacceptable mistreatment of Canadian citizens, the deplorable terrorism and instability it exports across the Middle East and beyond, and the pain and suffering it imposes on the Iranian people.

At this difficult time, we should all stand with Iranians in calling for an end to the regime's violence and oppression.

● (1705)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very glad to hear that my colleague will be supporting the motion, and hopefully many of his colleagues as well. Hopefully they will all be in good health and none of them will catch the flu on the day of the vote. Certainly we look forward to that taking place.

I want to ask my colleague a specific question about how we relate to Iran with respect to consular cases. We spoke about the case of Maryam Mombeini. Also he mentioned the case of Saeed Malekpour. He said that the government's first priority in engaging with Iran would be ensuring the permission to travel for Ms. Mombeini.

I want to get the assurance of the member of the government that the government will also not pursue any further discussions with Iran until Mr. Saeed Malekpour has also been released. If we are able to secure that permission to travel for Ms. Mombeini, surely we should also not take any further steps with the Iranian regime until Mr. Malekpour, who has been in prison for a very long time, is released at well.

Mr. Michael Levitt: Madam Speaker, our foreign affairs minister has been exceptionally clear. Any communications, any discussion with Iran is focused on the plight of Maryam Mombeini. We know that other Canadians have been impacted by this odious regime, and I hope we continue to advocate on their behalf as well. However, our minister could not have been any clearer in any communications going back and forth, that this is the focus and will continue to be the focus. We need to get Ms. Mombeini back to her sons in Canada.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. colleague. I am certainly glad that Canada has consistently spoken up for the rights of Canadians who have been held in Iranian jails and face torture, and we will continue to do that.

I was very surprised by my colleague's comments on Gaza, the horrific shootings by Israeli snipers against civilians, and the fact that Israeli military targeted a Canadian doctor, Dr. Tarek Loubani. Under the Geneva Convention, the targeting of medical staff is a crime, yet we have had numerous medics shot by Israeli snipers. I did not hear the member mention anything about Dr. Loubani when he talked about Gaza.

The Prime Minister said it was inexcusable. The international community said the shooting was inexcusable. Does the member support the call for an independent investigation into why Israeli military targeted a Canadian doctor who was doing medical work for civilians being shot by the Israeli army?

Mr. Michael Levitt: Madam Speaker, I do not know why the member is saying that the Israeli army targeted Dr. Loubani. I have not seen that anywhere. With respect to an independent investigation, yes, the Israelis have a judiciary and an independent investigative process that is beyond reproach.

The Canadian government right now is co-operating while the Israelis undertake that investigation. However, to claim that the doctor was targeted by Israeli soldiers is a reckless accusation.

● (1710)

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I enjoyed two points made by my colleague. First, he did a very good job of stating the difference between the regime and the people of Iran. I congratulate him in saying that the regime is responsible for the activity that is happening. We all know the regime has intolerable behaviour toward Jewish people and disseminate hate. However, he also touched on another religious minority, the Baha'i . I would like him to expand on what the regime is doing toward Baha'i and how that is unacceptable behaviour as well.

Mr. Michael Levitt: Madam Speaker, the plight of the Baha'i is something that we focused on at the Subcommittee on International Human Rights. I am honoured that the Baha'i community of Canada has told us first-hand of the repression that its minority religion faces in Iran each and every day.

We know that a number of Baha'i have been held as political prisoners in Iranian jails, and we are pleased that a number of those have been released. However, we know the repression continues. We know children are not allowed to get an education. We know there is civil discrimination occurs against the Baha'i, the most peaceful of minorities that could possibly be in Iran.

Canadians will continue to raise our voices, both as parliamentarians and in general, to ensure that the plight of the Baha'i is not forgotten in Canada.

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canada's approach to Iran has been focused on careful coordination with our allies, the pursuit of Canadian interests, and the promotion of Canadian values. Chief among these is the pursuit of consular cases and the promotion and protection of human rights.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs has been very clear on this: As long as Maryam Mombeini is denied the right to leave Iran, the focus of any discussion will be on ensuring that she is able to leave Iran and return home to Canada. Our government is committed to providing help and assistance to Canadians abroad. That includes advocating strongly for the freedom of Maryam Mombeini and for the release of Saeed Malekpour.

As has been said, the Minister of Foreign Affairs has raised these consular issues directly with the Iranian authorities. Two weeks ago, she spoke to the Iranian foreign minister about Maryam Mombeini. Our government cares deeply about human rights and consular issues, and, for the benefit of members opposite, that is the clear focus of any of our discussions with Iran. I should acknowledge that this is what Canadians expect of us, and this is our government's policy with Iran. This is exactly what we are doing.

Canadians also expect us to continue to work in conjunction with our friends and allies and the broader international community to achieve shared objectives. Canada works with its partners to undertake international efforts to rein in the revolutionary regime and limit the terribly damaging effect of its actions. Canadian values provide an important contribution to our engagement with our allies. It is through these means that Canada protects Canadian interests and Canadians abroad.

Canada has been one of the strongest critics of Iran's support for terrorism abroad, including its support for the murderous Assad regime in Syria, Hezbollah, and Hamas, and its incitement against Iran. We are also strong critics of Iran's poor human rights record. There has been consistent advocacy on our part for the rights of the Baha'i, protection of Iran's Jewish community, and an end to unlawful imprisonment, torture, and capital punishment.

Our government has advocated for the rights of women and girls, freedom of speech, the right to protest peacefully, and the implementation of the rule of law. Since 2003, Canada has been the lead sponsor of the annual United Nations resolution on the situation of human rights in Iran. The most recent iteration of the resolution was successfully adopted in December 2017 with support from a cross-regional group of countries, underscoring the fact that the international community remains deeply concerned about human rights violations in Iran.

The government of Iran actively works against the annual adoption of this resolution, which provides an ongoing spotlight on the human rights violations carried out by the regime. Iran is well aware that Canada is leading this international effort.

Canada's engagement with the United Nations on human rights is reflective of another consistent element of Canada's approach to Iran, which is the requirement to work in concert with our like-minded friends to bring collective weight against Iran to adjust its actions and policies. There is strength in numbers. Collective action prevents Iran from playing one country off against another in order to avoid being held to account for its actions.

This has been especially the case with economic sanctions. Sanctions are a tool that Canada has used over the years to try to address Iran's behaviour. Sanctions can be implemented unilaterally or as a result of UN Security Council resolutions. Canada has used both methods of sanctions over the years. We also use our export control process with a view to preventing the delivery of certain controlled goods to Iran.

While Canada's autonomous sanctions can serve a specific targeted purpose, it is generally acknowledged that international sanctions prove more effective in modifying the behaviour of the countries being sanctioned. Sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council, as well as autonomous sanctions by a number of countries, including Canada, the EU, and the U.S., play a central role in bringing Iran to the negotiating table over its nuclear program.

Iran's exports of crude oil and related revenues were dramatically decreased. The government of Iran and its institutions and businesses were cut off from the international financial system. This collective pressure forced Iran to negotiate on its nuclear program and to accept a deal that provides unprecedented oversight by the International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, on Iran's nuclear program to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability.

● (1715)

Canada strongly supported these sanctions and welcomed the January 16, 2016 confirmation by the IAEA that Iran had implemented the necessary upfront commitments under the JCPOA for the deal to be implemented.

In response, Canada amended its autonomous sanctions under the special economic measures, Iran, regulations in February 2016, in order to recognize the progress made under the JCPOA and to allow for cautious economic re-engagement while continuing to restrict the export of proliferation-sensitive goods and technologies to Iran.

Canada still maintains a robust sanctions regime against Iran. Entities and individuals with links to proliferation activities or to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps continue to be listed under the special economic measures, Iran, regulations.

In closing, I would like to be very clear that any discussions between Canada and Iran are focused on consular cases. Canadians want to know that their government will fight for them and be there for them when they are in distress abroad, and we will continue to do this. We will continue to seek answers in the death of Canadian Iranian Kavous Seyed-Emami. We will continue to seek the freedom for his widow, Maryam Mombeini, to leave Iran, and we will continue to call for the release of Saeed Malekpour.

As well, our goal has always been, and will continue to be, the safe return of the Azer children to Canada. We are inspired by the strength and conviction of their mother, and we will continue to express this directly to Mrs. Azer. The safety and well-being of her children is a priority for us. I would like to commend the member for Courtenay—Alberni for his advocacy and commitment.

Canadians are proud of their country's strong and consistent support for human rights across the world, and we are committed to meeting the expectations of Canadians in this regard.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciated listening to the speech by my colleague across the way. She mentioned that the government and the Prime Minister are very concerned about human rights and individuals. When we look at the case of Iran, I am wondering why the Prime Minister took months to respond to protests in Iran and only mentioned them in response to a question on the issue from the opposition. Why did the Prime Minister not express immediate support for the pro-democracy demonstrations by the people?

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones: Madam Speaker, we were one of the first countries to issue a statement. We deeply oppose Iran's support for terrorist organizations, its threats, its ballistic missile program, and its support for the murderous Assad regime. We will always defend human rights. We will always hold Iran to account for its actions.

I would like to be very clear. Our government is committed to holding Iran to account for its violations of human and democratic rights. That is why Canada led a resolution at the UN in November calling on Iran to comply with its international human rights obligations, something we have been entirely consistent about for almost two decades.

● (1720)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and good friend from West Vancouver —Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country for her speech. I particularly want to thank her for standing by the principle that Canada should be talking to those we disagree with as a pathway to peace.

She cited the Azer file. We know that when Canadians abroad are in trouble, especially in Iran, if we do not have a presence there and a relationship, we are relying on our partners, in this case Italy, Jordan, or the U.K., all of whom have a presence in Iran. Since the Conservatives closed our embassy in Iran, we do not have a direct relationship. Even the United States has a special interest section working with Iran.

Could the member tell us when Canada will have an embassy in Iran so we can make sure we have a strong voice representing Canadians when they are in trouble in other consular files?

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones: Madam Speaker, the Azer case is certainly a priority. At the moment, we have a Canadian in harm's way, and that is a top priority.

Our government places the highest value on providing consular assistance to Canadians in distress abroad. We are deeply concerned and shocked by the death of Canadian citizen Dr. Kavous Seyed-Emami, and we continue to call for answers regarding his death and detention. We are outraged that his widow, Mrs. Maryam Mombeini, a Canadian citizen, has been barred from leaving Iran, and we are steadfast in our resolve to focus on these incredibly important consular cases.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to follow up on some comments made by the parliamentary secretary for consular affairs. He told us that it was inappropriate for members of the opposition to ask questions about specific consular cases by name, and he said that the Liberal Party never did that. He criticized us for making these cases partisan.

I was checking the record, and he might remember, since he has been a member of Parliament for a long time, that, in fact, on February 23, 2015, the current Minister of Science asked a question in the House specifically about an individual consular case, saying that, from her perspective, the government was not doing enough. The Minister of Innovation made similar comments in the media. Two ministers specifically criticized the government's approach to sensitive consular cases while they were going on.

Does the member think that it is legitimate to have debates in the House about individual consular cases so that the opposition can challenge and criticize the government's handling of them? Is that something we should be doing?

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones: I believe that each and every member of Parliament cares an awful lot about Canadians in distress abroad. It is egregious and unacceptable to make any of those cases a partisan issue.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, at the outset, I would like to say that I will be sharing my time with the member for Calgary Midnapore.

I will interrupt my speech at the beginning because of an interesting comment made by my Liberal colleague across the floor. I would like to turn her attention to a Facebook post on the Liberal Party website, from August 29, 2015. In the middle of the election, the Liberal Party chose to make the consular issue of Mohamed Fahmy an election issue. If there is any egregiousness about making a case a political and partisan issue, surely the Liberal Party has to realize the hypocrisy of bringing up such a case in the middle of an election. However, I will move on now.

First and foremost, I would like to rise today to declare that I will always stand by and support the State of Israel, the homeland of the Jewish people and also home to people of many faiths and nations. I am proud to live in a country and serve in a parliament that stands as a steadfast ally to our friend and ally, Israel. I would also like to affirm my support for the aspirations of the Palestinian and the Iranian people for a future when they can enjoy the benefits of a sovereign country that respects the fundamental freedoms of its citizens and the integrity of its neighbours' borders. I also want to say that I have had the pleasure of serving with the descendants of Baha'i refugees to this country in the Canadian Armed Forces. These are people who are loyal to Canada, and they love this country. I want to say that I support the Baha'i minority.

Today I have been called to speak on behalf of my constituents to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its constant assault on the State of Israel and for its actions that have destabilized the region through the sponsorship of terrorist groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah. I am also very concerned about evidence that shows the Islamic Republic of Iran's progress toward the production of weapons of mass destruction, despite an agreement reached with the world that sanctions would be lifted if Iran ceased its pursuit of these nuclear weapons. Finally, I cannot fail to mention the economic mismanagement that has used a windfall to promote the ideology of the regime while the people suffer under economic privation.

The evidence of Iran's nuclear program, presented recently by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and supported by the U. S. administration, is deeply concerning. Canada cannot stand by and normalize relations with a country that continues to harbour dangerous nuclear ambitions as it continues to develop ballistic missile capabilities that will only lead to further conflict in the region. An Iranian regime with nuclear capabilities and ballistic missiles would present a serious threat to our allies and set off an arms race similar to that which led up to the First World War, and I fear with similar consequences.

The Iranian people are ill-served by a government that continues to pursue ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons at the expense of providing its people with a safe and secure society to live in. Sanctions imposed will have a material impact on the lives of everyday Iranians, yet the regime refuses to take any action to improve the situation. The constant provocations of the Ayatollah and his government, such as calling for the destruction of the State of Israel, cannot be tolerated. Canada must no longer stand by and allow the provocations of the regime to go unanswered. We must stand steadfast with our allies in opposing the aspirations of the Iranian regime to violently expand its influence in the region while continuing to oppress its people under a theocratic regime.

The consequences of not acting will be to risk further bloodshed in an already war-torn region. It will set back the cause of freedom in Iran as the regime uses its new oil wealth to enrich the few and fund violent global adventures. Economic prosperity does not beget political freedom. Only when the Iranian regime recognizes the fundamental rights of its people to freedom of conscience, religion, assembly, and speech and the freedom of the press can the Iranian people truly chart their nation's destiny.

This motion calls on the Liberal government to cease negotiations aimed at restoring diplomatic relations with Iran. Although I would agree that it is always a good idea to keep a line of communication open, the drive to normalize relations with the regime is offside with the values of Canadians. It goes without saying that Canadians value peace, we value a government that respects the rights of the individual, and we oppose the violent imposition of values by a totalitarian regime.

We see Canadians who are unjustly being held in Iran, such as the widow of Professor Kavous Seyed-Emami, Mrs. Maryam Mombeini, who was denied the right to return to Canada. Professor Kavous Seyed-Emami died under mysterious circumstances in the notorious Evin prison, the Bastille of Iran, where political prisoners are kept.

● (1725)

The family refuses to accept the official explanation of the regime that he died by suicide, and as a Canadian, I refuse to accept that explanation. The family has faced constant harassment from the regime. I call on the government to support the motion and continue to do all it can to secure the release of our citizens, including the remains of our citizen that are being held in Iran.

This disrespect for Canadian citizens at a time when the Canadian government has indicated its support for the normalization of relations and for the joint comprehensive plan of action indicates to me that the regime is uninterested in working in good faith with our government. It is clear to me that the best means to achieve Canada's aims is to project strength. We must declare the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, the IRGC, which is a critical piece of the regime's governing apparatus, a designated terrorist organization. This organization is the equivalent of the Condor Legion that fought on the nationalist side during the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s.

The regime uses the IRGC to train local troops that will be loyal to its aims and ideology. It also means that it is creating battle-hardened Iranian units ready to conduct operations across the region. This level of aggression must not be allowed to go without consequences, and by designating the IRGC a terrorist entity, we can further restrict its operations.

Over the past few years, the Iranian regime has used the breathing space granted by the removal of sanctions to ramp up its support for the regime of Bashar al-Assad. It has provided clandestine support for rebels in Yemen and has continued to support organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas. These are just a few notable cases of how the Iranian regime is sponsoring conflict and destabilizing the region.

Recently, Israel came under attack as waves of Molotov cocktail kites and those who wished to breach the border defences descended upon Israel. The loss of life by innocent Palestinians is truly tragic, and the Hamas regime, which has shown little regard for the lives of civilians in Gaza, is directly responsible.

I would also be remiss if I did not recognize that on this side of the House, there is no question that Israel was under attack by a terrorist organization and that the right of Israel to act in self-defence was justified. I am happy to see that the Prime Minister has finally recognized Hamas's responsibility for this attack and reaffirmed Israel's right to self-defence.

It was also unnerving this past weekend, during the holy time of Ramadan, that an Al-Quds Day rally in Toronto yet again targeted the people of Israel and Jews across the world. I was proud to see Ontario's new premier-elect, Doug Ford, signal that this would be the last time under his watch that such a rally, with its blatant anti-Semitism and message of hate, would be allowed a platform in Toronto. That is the kind of leadership we need in this country, leadership that unambiguously stands up against hatred. Canadians want a government that will stand up against Iranian oppression and in support of our ally, the State of Israel.

I remember on May 5, 2015, when the New Democratic Party pulled off its surprising upset victory against the Progressive Conservative dynasty in Alberta. As I watched the news in disbelief, I received a call from my grandmother. I remember her words today: "I just wanted to let you know I voted NDP, but I really hope this doesn't hurt Prime Minister Stephen Harper, because I know he stands for the State of Israel." For many, like those in my family, this support comes from a deep-seated faith, but for many across Canada, it is also a recognition that Israel stands for so much of what we stand for in our own country, principles like liberty, equality, democracy, and the rule of law.

All free and democratic nations must stand together against terrorism and tyranny. A house divided against itself surely cannot stand, and if we fail to back our ally Israel and stand behind the people of Iran as they fight against their regime and its systematic violations of international law, we are only weakening ourselves.

● (1730)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague said that our government has a drive to normalize relations. A couple of sentences later, he said that we need to do all we can to ensure that Canadians are safe or are returned safely.

The Prime Minister, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the parliamentary secretary, and in fact all of our caucus oppose Iran's support for terrorist organizations, its threats toward Israel, its missile program, and the vile and murderous Assad regime. We adamantly denounce violence, hate speech, racism, and anti-Semitism, domestically and abroad. Therefore, I am wondering if my hon. colleague does not believe that there is room for the policy of engagement and dialogue that allows us to adamantly and fervently bring up issues of human rights and protect Canadians who are in trouble abroad.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I view it as no disconnect. We can strongly stand against the Iranian regime. We can refuse to normalize relations with the Iranian regime, but at the same time, that does not mean that there could not be some back channels that exist to help us out in consular cases. I see no disconnect there.

It is very clear that the Iranian regime is not a normal regime, and under no circumstances should we be normalizing any of our relations with it.

● (1735)

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the issues Iranians here in Canada have identified as fallout from the situation is that they themselves are being discriminated against. For example, at the heritage committee, we discussed Motion No. 103. Representatives from the Iranian Canadian Congress came before committee and told us that one day, Iranians in Canada would suddenly find themselves having their bank accounts closed for no reason other than the fact that they are Iranian. There is fallout with respect to the situation.

I am not advocating by any stretch of the imagination the human rights abuses that are going on in Iran. I am absolutely against some of the comments that have been made targeting the Jewish community. Nobody wants to see that kind of history repeating itself.

That said, how can we address the impact on Iranians in Canada as a result of the situation in Iran? Would a diplomatic approach not address some of these issues? Would it not be better for Canada to have a path forward to move toward peace through diplomatic channels?

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak to the cases my hon. colleague has brought forward, but I can speak to my trust in the Canadian security services and their role in monitoring the accounts and ensuring that Canadian banks and Canadian financial resources are not being used illegally to finance a rogue regime.

I can speak to a situation involving a very close friend of mine whose fiancé is an Iranian national and has been targeted by the regime while living in Canada. We cannot stand by and normalize relations with a country that is targeting citizens in this country. We must stand against that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear some of the comments from other members about the Iranian people. A lot of Iranian people I have talked to in this country do not feel that the Iranian Canadian Congress speaks for them, but that is a topic for another day, perhaps.

NDP members say that we need to be talking to the Iranian people. Of course we do. We need to be engaging with Iran's pro-democracy movement. We need to be engaging with the people of Iran and the Iranian community in this country, which, by and large, are calling for dramatic political change in Iran. They are supportive of the protest movement and recognize that there can be no reform from within with the current structure of the system, which completely excludes dissent.

I wonder if the member could comment on this. I have felt so inspired by the response by the Iranian people in fighting back against the regime. Political change in Iran would presage much greater peace throughout the region and would help to address so many different conflicts in which the Iranian government is the instigator. Does the member feel similarly inspired by the courage of the Iranian people and the protest movements and other movements we have seen in response to this?

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I am inspired by the Iranian community here in Canada that, by and large, wants to hold the regime accountable because its members have suffered under it.

I think of the Iran Democratic Association and the great work it does here on Parliament Hill to raise issues of concern and to advocate for the families whose members were killed in the 1980s, which was hidden by the regime. We need to hold the regime accountable. I stand with groups like the Iran Democratic Association.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in the House of Commons today regarding the condemnation of Iran. My party worked hard to support a principled foreign policy approach while in government. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Stephen Harper, Canada was a world leader on promoting democracy to all nations. The Conservative government defended our values and interests of freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law on the world stage.

In Iran, freedoms are far from warranted, and the people there are facing severe injustices. The people of Iran are facing no freedom of speech or assembly, and the political rights of women, LGBT communities, and ethnic or religious minorities are practically non-existent. With ruthless consequences for speaking out against their government's atrocities, a strong and free Canada needs to start holding this regime accountable.

I want to make it clear that my condemnation is of the Iranian regime and its policies, not the Iranian people. Under the current regime, the Iranian people have suffered. While economic sanctions were lifted on Iran as part of the nuclear deal, fuel and food prices have been rising, along with inequality. This is due in large part to endemic economic mismanagement and corruption within the regime, leading to inflation and unemployment. Ordinary citizens hoped that the nuclear deal would bring economic relief, but the regime has stood in the way of any real progress.

The Iranian government is not elected through free and fair elections, and limits Iranian citizens' rights to exercise their freedoms of belief, expression, and assembly. In late 2017 and early 2018, thousands of Iranian people took to the streets to show their opposition to a government that is corrupt, authoritarian, and unjust. I commend them for their courage to stand up for freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. The Iranian regime responded with excessive force and created further restrictions on social media. Thousands were arrested, and more than 20 people lost their lives in the unrest. This was an unacceptable, but not unsurprising response from a regime that has been oppressing its very own people for years.

Beyond the impact that Iran has on its own people, it is also a bad actor across the Middle East. The country has been a long-time backer of Hezbollah, a violent terror organization, and vocally supported the brutal Assad regime during the Syrian civil war. Iran actively contributes to violence, instability, and the spread of terror across the Middle East, and therefore around the world. Iran also has a long history of threatening our good friend and ally, Israel. Recently, Ayatollah Khamenei tweeted that "Israel is a malignant cancerous tumour" and that it "has to be removed and eradicated". The regime is anti-Semitic, pure and simple.

I condemn, in the strongest terms, Iran's aggression in the region, its oppression of Iranian citizens, its stance on Israel, and its sponsorship of terrorism. Given the country's track record, it is of the utmost importance that Iran never gains nuclear capabilities. Canada is no stranger on advocating for rights and freedoms globally. In Afghanistan, Canada played an integral role in protecting the Afghan people and ensuring that Afghan national security forces are well trained so that they can assume full responsibility for their own national security. In Libya, our men and women did more than their share, performing over 1,388 raids to help protect civilian lives, and putting an end to the Gadhafi regime.

● (1740)

Currently, our brave men and women are in Iraq providing an advise-and-assist mission against ISIS. For the next two years, we will be there to help the Iraqi Kurdish forces resist the advances of these genocidal terrorists, and carry out air strikes against ISIS targets in Syria.

However, rights and freedoms are elusive at best in this Islamic Republic. Civil society in Iran is quickly deteriorating as they move to detain academics, journalists, and activists in Iran. This brutal regime is becoming a dire threat to the peace and security all around the world. Although we care deeply for the people of Iran, Canadian citizens have also suffered greatly. Not only has the well-known Canadian professor Kavous Seyed-Emami recently died suspiciously in an Iranian prison, but Iran is preventing his wife, also a Canadian citizen, from returning to Canada.

Maryam Mombeini was barred from leaving Iran on a Canada-bound flight with her sons Ramin and Mehran Seyed-Emami. The family has faced severe harassment, threats, and smear campaigns over their refusal to accept the Iranian authorities' claim that Kavous Seyed-Emami died by suicide in prison. The two sons were permitted to travel back to Vancouver, but they had to leave their mother in Tehran. This travel ban is absolutely unacceptable, and explicitly violates United Nations conventions. Our government should be working harder to uphold our responsibility to protect the rights of Canadians abroad.

Today we are calling on the government to denounce appeasement of the Iranian regime, and instead continue to be a global leader in upholding human rights abroad. Immediate action is needed. We must call on Iran to lift the travel ban on Maryam Mombeini and sanction Iran's leaders and other gross human rights offenders under Canada's Magnitsky law.

We must communicate support for the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2012, and reiterate that Iran is a state sponsor of terror. This House should pass Bill S-219 to deter Iran-sponsored terrorism that incites hatred and human rights violations. Commercial relations between Bombardier and Iran should be reviewed.

We must recognize that Iran is complicit in the atrocious war crimes of Syria's Bashar al-Assad. We need to boycott the UN Conference on Disarmament to protest Syria's election as chair. Canada should cease immediately from referring to the Iranian regime as "elected", or any other references to democracy. We need to speak up regarding Iran's protest movement, and start standing in agreement with the people of Iran.

Lastly, the Government of Canada must recognize that the people of Iran, like Canadians, have a fundamental right to freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of thought, belief, opinion, and expression, including freedom of the press and other forms of communication, and finally the freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of association.

Anything else is condoning the shameful and hateful republic. This is not who we are as humanitarians, and, more importantly, this is not who we are as Canadians.

● (1745)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, certainly we share the member's concerns, and unequivocally condemn the comments made by Iranian leaders that threaten the destruction of Israel. We also condemn any support given by the Iranian government for terror groups in the Middle East, whether it be Syria, Iraq, or elsewhere.

However, New Democrats believe that Canada has an important diplomatic role to play in bringing Iran back into the mainstream international community, and denouncing the Iran regime cannot replace strong diplomacy.

We have consular cases. The member talked about Canadians abroad who are in trouble. We currently have Canadians in Iran who are in trouble, and we do not have a clear path in our communication with Iran. That is unlike our allies, the Italians, the U.K., Jordan, or even the United States, where they have a special interest section. All of these countries are allies and have direct ways of communicating to Iran, and that is not just on consular files, but also on abuses that are happening within Iran. They are able to cite their concerns directly to Iran.

Does the member not believe that opening up diplomatic relations would help protect Canadians abroad on consular files, so that Canada can convey our concerns about human rights abuses and about certainly comments and atrocities that the Iranian government has made? Does she not believe that opening up diplomatic relations so that we can relay our concerns directly to the Iranian government would help?

● (1750)

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan said this morning, I believe it would not be prudent at this time for us to have a diplomatic presence in Tehran. In fact, we would be putting the lives of Canadian diplomats there in danger, which is very much a concern for me.

However, as a former diplomat, and someone who has worked as a policy adviser for the member for Thornhill in his role as the minister of state for Latin Americas, at that time, I was very open to evaluating alternative paths forward in our relationship with Cuba. It was a special time. It was 2008, and President Obama had come into place. The Helms–Burton Act was being reviewed. Remissions were being re-evaluated in regard to the United States, as well as visitation rights. I felt that perhaps Canada had a special role to play as a mediator and a special player in relationship to both the U.S. and Cuba. Therefore, I am very much open to ideas in regard to diplomacy. However, one must look at who one is dealing with, and if the other party is not willing to listen, in some cases diplomacy is futile.

Mr. David Sweet (Flamborough—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have more of a comment.

The Iranian regime of Ayatollah Khamenei is an extraordinarily tyrannical regime that is matchless in the world. Therefore, I would defend everything the member said by explaining that for the last 13 years, the Subcommittee on International Human Rights has never had more cases of human rights violations as we have had from Iran. In fact, we have Iran accountability week, which derived from our committee for that very reason.

This is a regime that kills its own citizens. It targets Baha'is, Ismailis, or anybody who has anything to say against the regime. It has a very intricate structure of terror as well, from people like those in the Basij, who are on the ground terrorizing people when they are protesting, and will use knives to cut ligaments in their legs, etc., to make sure they demoralize the crowd. The Revolutionary Guard Corps very handily exports terror, and grafts money from its citizens and exports it out of the country as well. We have a lot of evidence on that. I could go on and on.

However, the government often talks about our reputation on the world stage. By normalizing relations with a regime like Iran, it can do nothing but harm our reputation on the world stage. I defend my colleague's speech on making sure that does not happen.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Mr. Speaker, United Nations reform is a passion of mine, and something that I am committed to in the future.

I will close by saying that the official opposition, the Conservative Party of Canada, has always been the party of human rights and democracy abroad under Stephen Harper, with Jason Kenney and the Hon. John Baird, and we will continue to serve as that.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Eglinton—Lawrence.

I want to thank everyone who has given me the opportunity to talk about Iran, because this is an issue that is very important to all Canadians, but in particular to those in the Iranian Canadian community in my riding, who have been the greatest victims of the regime that is currently in place in Iran.

They have suffered from political oppression. The Baha'i community, whose religion is not recognized as a religion in the Iranian constitution, has suffered endless streams of discrimination. The Jewish community, the Christian community, and religious minorities in Iran have all suffered, and those who have come here understand what they went through and what their friends and families in Iran are still going through as a result of this regime.

This motion in no way imputes any fault to the Iranian people or to the Iranian Canadian community. It solely singles out the totalitarian, authoritarian, repressive regime currently in place in the Islamic republic of Iran.

Why is it so important to talk about Iran? There are other regimes out there that are theocracies. There other regimes out there, unfortunately, that violate fundamental human rights. There are other regimes out there that discriminate against women. There are other regimes out there that single out our ally Israel. However, what is unique about the Iranian regime is they export their horrible record abroad.

They encourage Yemen to also discriminate against the Baha'i community. They support terrorist groups like Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, and Hamas to wreak havoc on the Middle East, including what recently occurred in Gaza. While Hamas is no doubt responsible for the violence that occurred and the unfortunate death of Palestinians in Gaza, Iran, behind the scenes, financed Hamas and gave it weapons to fire rockets and projectiles on peaceful civilians in Israel.

It is Iran, behind the scenes, that has helped the murderous Assad regime in Syria kill thousands of their own citizens with poison gas and has caused the dislocation of millions.

Iran has chosen to export its terror abroad. Iran has chosen to single out one country for condemnation, the most democratic country in the Middle East, one that respects the rights of people of all religions in the country, and one that has an independent judiciary that is prized around the world: Israel.

We have all been talking about world leaders who like to tweet. One of the world leaders who likes to tweet is the supreme religious leader of Iran, Ayatollah Sayyid Ali Khamenei. While his remarks are odious, I think it is important to put on the record of this Parliament what this gentleman has put on his Twitter account this year.

"Israel Is A Hideous Entity In the Middle East Which Will Undoubtedly Be Annihilated."

"Our stance against Israel is the same stance we have always taken. #Israel is a malignant cancerous tumor in the West Asian region that has to be removed and eradicated: it is possible and it will happen." That was on June 3.

"Woe to the heads of those dependent and traitorous countries, who refrain from the great duty of fighting against #Israel and defending #Palestine only to win U.S's attention and a few more days of power." This was on June 2, 2018.

"Friendship with the unbelievers brings misery to Muslims, like the friendship some Muslim states have with the Zionist regime, exchanging kind words and establishing economic or political relations." This was on April 26, 2018.

He went out of his way to say, "God's curse be upon the arrogant powers, their agents, as well as the vicious Zionist regime and the U.S. for destroying Muslims". This was on January 30, 2018.

He has also called Israel "barbaric", "infanticidal", and "sinister, unclean rabid dog of the region".

I can only say that this man's tweets bring shame upon his country, and it is unfortunate that we, in this world today, have to deal with a world leader who is so intent on destroying one small country in the region, the homeland of the Jewish people.

However, we should not be surprised, because after all, this gentleman is also a Holocaust denier. With respect to the six million Jews and the many other millions of gay people, Jehovah's witnesses, and others who perished in the Nazi Holocaust, this gentleman is not sure it really happened.

● (1755)

That is why in 2016 for the second time Iran held a Holocaust cartoon competition and invited anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers from across the world to exhibit their wares in Tehran with a grand prize. Yom HaShoah is the day that is sacred to tens of thousands of Holocaust survivors living in Canada today, who found refuge on our shores from the vicious murderous entity that they had escaped in Europe. This gentleman, Ayatollah Khamenei, on Holocaust Remembrance Day in 2016 published a video in which he said, "No one in European countries dares to speak about the Holocaust, while it is not clear whether the core of this matter is reality or not. Even if it is reality, it is not clear how it happened." The video featured images of Holocaust deniers Roger Garaudy, David Irving, and Robert Faurisson. That is shocking.

It is a regime that today still denies the Holocaust. It imputes to those who survived the Holocaust and came to Israel the idea that they should then be obliterated from the face of the earth. I am proud to stand as part of a government that supports Israel, a government that will defend Israel and recognize that Israel not only has a right to exist, but has a right to defend itself against rockets that stream across its borders.

Israel faced the situation in Gaza. I cannot imagine any country in the world that would have acted in a different way, had terrorists encouraged and incited people to stream against its borders firing projectiles and announcing to them that the border had been breached, to go forward, and putting women, children, and infants in front of the line. That is a disgrace.

I also want to talk about my predecessor as the member of Parliament for Mount Royal, the hon. Irwin Cotler. He was someone with a principled foreign policy, and someone who believed in non-partisanship, and someone who reached across the aisle and created an Iran accountability week that the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs still runs that includes members of all parties. I have been honoured to sit in on a couple of those committee hearings where we have heard from victims of the Iranian regime, when we have heard from the Baha'i community here in Canada about the horrendous treatment of Baha'is in Iran, when we have heard that Iran executes more people per capita than any other country, including minors.

All parties in the House have joined together to hold Iran to account and Canada has led on that issue by bringing forward and sponsoring resolutions at the United Nations to condemn the human rights violations of the Iranian regime.

I am very pleased to have the chance to stand in the House today and support a resolution that condemns Iran. We should all condemn Iran for its human rights violations at home, for its importation of human rights violations abroad, for its support of terrorist organizations throughout the Middle East, for its support of the butchering Assad regime in Syria, for its denial of the Holocaust, for its threat of genocide against the Jewish people, for its attempts to eradicate Israel from the face of the earth, and for its desire to become a nuclear power and proliferate nuclear arms across the Middle East. That deserves to be denounced and I am pleased to have had the opportunity to do so today.

● (1800)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we absolutely support my colleague in denouncing the Iranian leadership on its comments and threats toward Israel. We want to open up the conversation with Iran so that we can speak directly to Iran about its human rights atrocities within Iran. We know that denouncing the Iranian regime cannot replace strong democracy.

Does my colleague support the opening of an embassy and diplomatic relations with Iran so we can speak directly to Iran in our opposition to its human rights abuses, in the way it is treating Israel and its support of the regimes in the Middle East, whether they be in Syria, Iraq, or elsewhere? Will the member speak to that and if Canada does support opening an embassy, how soon would we be doing that?

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the parliamentary secretary have been abundantly clear that the only issue that we will be discussing with Iran is the fate of Maryam Mombeini, who should be released immediately, what happened to her husband, Professor Kavous Seyed-Emami, who I believe was murdered in prison as opposed to having committed suicide, and following up on the fate of Mr. Malekpour, who has been in prison since 2008. That is all we should be doing.

With respect to rewarding a gentleman who is a Holocaust denier and somebody who wants to eradicate Israel from the face of the earth by upgrading our diplomatic relations, I do not think now is the time to do so.

● (1805)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I certainly share my colleague's sentiments. There has been some discussion back and forth here about having an embassy opened in Iran. One of the points that has not been answered directly from our friends in the NDP is this issue of the safety of Canadian officials. One of the things that Iran does, in addition to what the member mentioned, is attack diplomatic staff. My colleague from Courtenay—Alberni mentioned the British having a diplomatic presence there. In 2011, in response to British government policy toward Iran, there were riots whereby British diplomatic properties were attacked and burned. We have seen similar things happen with other countries. Does the member agree with me that to put our diplomats into Iran at a time when the Iranian government does not follow any normal rules of engagement and to then be legitimately critical of its human rights record would further endanger the lives of our diplomats, and that there are other ways where we can engage that do not involve creating that significant risk to those who serve Canada abroad?

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with my colleague from Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan that before putting diplomats in any location we need to look at the safety of those diplomats. The fact that in 1979, upon the new Iranian regime taking power, the American embassy was besieged and American prisoners taken is certainly at the roots of this regime that is currently in power in Iran. Therefore, I would certainly agree with my colleague that, right now, we should solely be focused on freeing Ms. Mombeini, getting answers on Mr. Malekpour and seeking to get him out of Iran as well, and not doing anything to put our diplomats in harm's way.

Mr. Michael Levitt (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we have heard a lot of reflections in this House, and we have heard some strong condemnations of this regime. I want to particularly focus for a second on the issue of Iran's domestic repression of human rights, something I know this member cares about. He sat in on the Subcommittee on International Human Rights, as he mentioned, during Iran accountability week. We have heard from the LGBTQ community. We have heard from women. We have heard from the Baha'i. We have heard from political prisoners and families of political prisoners who are being held. We have heard about this odious regime and its denial of fundamental freedoms. We have heard about its denial of justice and due process. I would just like to hear from the member his thoughts on how the Iranian regime can be held to account, and how we as Canadians can add our voice to ensuring that the plight of these individuals in Iran, of Iranians under this regime, is not forgotten.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for York Centre for his incredible work on this file. For me, it is very clear. Canada has to play a leadership role across the world in defending the people of Iran and making sure that human rights are upheld in Iran. That includes the Baha'is and the LGBTQ+. That includes everybody. One of the ways that we have already started on the path to do it is to recognize certain Iranian organizations as terrorist organizations. Also, we have led on the issue of imposing a Magnitsky act, which perhaps could be applied to certain Iranian officials.

Mr. Marco Mendicino (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to speak on this motion, which calls for the condemnation of the Iranian regime for its sponsorship of terrorism, human rights violations, and, most egregiously, its repugnant calls for genocide against the Jewish people and the state of Israel.

There are a number of reasons why the motion merits support, but none is more important, more transcendent than the deep and abiding strength of Canada's friendship with Israel. I am proud to say that our friendship is very strong. That is because our two countries enjoy close people-to-people ties on a number of shared priorities.

In my riding, I think of the profound and prominent people of the Jewish community. I see them in the shuls, in the schools, in the camps, and it is a privilege to represent them in the House every day. Those priorities include commerce, trade, national security, and the fight against terrorism when it comes to our two states.

The government's commitment deepening the bonds between Canada and Israel can be seen through many examples, most recently the Minister of International Trade's announcement on the modernization of the Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement. Under CIFTA's new provisions, there will be expanded trade, additional reduced tariffs, and the adoption of voluntary CSR standards by enterprises. Together, these improvements will benefit domestic businesses and exporters, growing the more than $1.7 billion in merchandise trade that exists between Canada and Israel.

However, it is not just commerce and trade where our economies are working together to drive opportunity. Canada and Israel have also forged an important strategic alliance, which plays a vital role in preserving peace and stability in the Middle East, and I will come to that.

When it comes to national security, there are scarcely two countries that co-operate more in the region. We work closely with Israel through exchanges of information, close collaboration on day-to-day operations, and routine bilateral visits at the ministerial and official levels. I would highlight the most recent trip of the Minister of Public Safety to Israel where he advanced and deepened the degree of co-operation that exists between our two countries where we share technology, intelligence, and best practices, all of which strengthens our ability to keep our respective borders safe.

All of these examples evidence the deep ties that exist between Canada and Israel, but the true measure of our friendship lies in our shared values, the very apex of which is a profound respect for Israel and for the Jewish people. That is why the Iranian regime's conduct is so worthy of condemnation, as expressed by the language of the motion on the floor. It must be condemned for its threats against Israel, for its sponsorship of terrorism, for its incitement of violence in the Gaza, and for its repeated human rights violations against the Iranian people and Canadians alike.

Let me be clear. Iran's blatant calls for Israel's destruction, Ayatollah Khamenei's characterization of Israel as "a malignant cancerous tumor" that "must be eradicated", and most recently and troubling, the al-Quds day rally at Queen's Park in Toronto, in my hometown, where anti-Semitism ran rampant, are deplorable and unacceptable examples. Canada stands firmly against this kind of hatred, which is driven by fear.

It is for this reason that Canada stands on the international stage to stamp out this kind of hatred and to hold Iran to account.

How are we going to accomplish this objective? We are working with our global partners to call on Iranian authorities to respect human rights of the people of Iran, to halt its nuclear weapons ambitions, as well as to end its regional actions that persist in destabilising an already fragile environment.

In addition, as the Minister of Foreign Affairs has stated that discussions with the Iranian authorities are focused on consular issues, including ensuring that Maryam Mombeini is able to leave Iran and to return to Canada, her home. In fact, just two weeks ago, the minister raised the case of Maryam Mombeini directly with the Iranian minister of foreign affairs.

Canadians expect their government to raise these issues directly with Iran. They want to know that their governments will put the safety and well-being of Canadians at the foremost of our interests and efforts, and we are.

Let me be very clear. Canada remains deeply concerned by the behaviour of the Iranian government and its continued lack of respect for human rights, its long-term nuclear ambitions, its ongoing ballistic missiles program, its support for terrorism, and its regional actions, which are destabilizing. To respond to these threats, Canada maintains a robust sanction regime and controls on exports of proliferation-sensitive goods to Iran, including goods and technologies that could assist the development of Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile programs.

● (1810)

Under the Special Economic Measures Act, Canada continues to maintain a list of individuals and entities, including the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, subject to asset freezes, and with all whom transactions involving property are prohibited. Under the United Nations Act, Canada also implements the sanctions against Iran as decided by the UN Security Council in resolution 2231.

Beyond our domestic responses, Canada is a firm believer in the necessity and strength of multilateral action. Without coordinated multilateral action, our ability to influence meaningful change in Iran's behaviour is limited. To this end, Canada participates in many multilateral fora to work alongside our partners to continue addressing Iran's anti-proliferation risk.

Canada strongly supports the JCPOA monitoring and verification of the International Atomic Energy Agency. As a leading contributor to the IAEA, Canada has provided $11.5 million in voluntary contributions since 2014. Despite the United States' decision to withdraw from the JCPOA, we believe it remains in the interest of the international community to continue to implement the JCPOA in order to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons regime.

We are also concerned by Iranian actions in the Middle East, which are destabilizing and threaten the security of its neighbours, including our Canadian partners. On this front, Canada has committed to working with partners to counter Iran's threatening foreign policy, including its support for Hamas, the Syrian regime, Hezbollah, and Palestinian Islamic Jihad. We strongly condemn these groups and the violent and dangerous activities they undertake in the Middle East, which are so destabilizing.

We will continue to work with our partners in the region to come up with sustainable solutions to this threat and to promote peace and stability in the region.

We will continue to call on the Iranian regime to fully respect the rights of the Iranian people. I am sure that every member in the House can agree that the people of Iran deserve full access to human and democratic rights. Human rights are absolutely integral to our international engagement. We stand up for our values. We do not hesitate to speak up against human rights violations and abuses, wherever they take place.

When the protests took place in Iran in December 2017 and January 2018, Canada was one of the first countries to publicly express support for the Iranian people to exercise their basic right to protest peacefully. This government called on the Iranian authorities to uphold and respect democratic and human rights. The Minister of Foreign Affairs also publicly expressed our deep concerns over deaths and detentions of protesters in Iran. The Iranian people have the right to freely express themselves without facing violence or recrimination.

To promote respect for human rights in Iran, Canada also believes in the strength of civil society work. This is why the government regularly interacts with human rights groups, including Iranian religious and ethnic minorities, such as the Baha'i community. The Iranian Canadian community in Canada makes strong and meaningful contributions to Canada and to Canadian life, and so many wish to see greater freedoms and respect of human rights in Iran. Our government believes the same, and we continue to advocate strongly in this regard. That is why we seek to raise human rights and consular cases directly with Iranian authorities.

We will continue to call on Iranian authorities to immediately give Maryam Mombeini the freedom to exit Iran and to return to Canada. As our government has publicly stated, as long as Mrs. Mombeini is not able to leave Iran, the focus of any discussions with Iran will be on getting her home.

We are committed to promoting Canada's peaceful land democratic values abroad. We will continue to work with our partners to respond to the threats that Iran poses to international peace and security.

I want to acknowledge and thank the Prime Minister for his support of Israelis during this challenging time. He clearly stated, "Israel has every right to defend itself against the deplorable attacks by the terrorist groups Hamas and Islamic Jihad." Likewise, the Minister of Foreign Affairs was clear that "Canada strongly condemns the mortar attacks launched on Israeli civilians from Gaza." She has also condemned incursions by Iranian drones into Israeli airspace. Such acts of violence are unacceptable and threaten the long-term goal of a just and lasting peace.

Canada will continue to hold the Iranian regime to account. We continue to impose one of the strongest sanctions against the Iranian regime. We continue to be one of the strongest critics of Iran's human rights record. We will continue to lead and sponsor the annual UN resolution condemning human rights violations in Iran.

For all these reasons, this motion merits support. It merits support because the Iranian regime must be held accountable. It merits support because we are a friend to the Iranian people. It merits supports because Canada stands resolutely with Israel and the Jewish people on the strength of our shared values. I hope all members will support the motion.

● (1815)

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the member's speech. He identified clearly and he articulated very nicely that Iran was a state-sponsor of terrorism. It sponsors Hamas and it has been sponsors Syria. We know it conducts many human rights violations and is responsible for many abuses of human rights in its own country.

I wonder if he could tell the House why during the recent Hamas uprising against the border of Israel, why the Prime Minister would have called for an investigation into the response from Israel as opposed to quickly condemning Hamas.

● (1820)

Mr. Marco Mendicino: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague will have heard, if he were listening to my remarks, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs have, on numerous occasions, condemned Hamas for its incitement of hatred, terrorism, and violence against the state of Israel, and we have reaffirmed those principles today.

I would share the sentiment with my hon. colleague that we deplore the loss of any innocent life. It is precisely why we are supporting this motion and why Canada stands resolutely on the international stage with Israel and all of our partners to engender a just and lasting peace in the region.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we agree with my colleague that we unequivocally condemn the Iranian comments targeted toward Israel. We strongly condemn any support the Iranian government has given to terror groups in the Middle East.

The member talked quite extensively about human rights. He talked about the Iranian human rights abuses within Iran and why we should not have diplomatic relations with Iran. We believe that with diplomatic relations, we can convey our concerns, whether it be on human rights or on comments that the Iranian leadership has made toward Israel.

We know human rights abuses are happening in Saudi Arabia. Does he not feel that should also apply to the Saudi Arabian leadership, when it also has committed human rights atrocities, which are condemned around the world? Does he not believe that we should be in any diplomatic relations with it or at least consistent with Iran?

Mr. Marco Mendicino: Mr. Speaker, of course I believe in human rights, and this is the party of the charter. It is also the party that was one of the most seminal contributors to the body of international human rights at the United Nations, and we will stand and defend those values every day.

With respect to his question regarding how we are engaging, we understand that as long as Canadians, Iranians, and other individuals are oppressed by the Iranian regime, we will directly engage on issues like Maryam Mombeini, and that is where the focus of our energies is. On a go-forward basis, we would like to see peace in the region. The way we do that is by maintaining an adherence to the very human rights of which my hon. colleague speaks.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, could my colleague and friend comment on the degree to which Canada has demonstrated leadership on world peace, on issues of human rights, and so forth in the past and, no doubt, will demonstrate into the future, and how critically important it is to talk about Canadian values?

Mr. Marco Mendicino: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague pointed out, Canada has a record that is second to none on the international stage when it comes to standing up for human rights. We see that enshrined in our charter, and it informs all our government's policies.

When it comes to standing up for equality of opportunity, prosperity, the right to express oneself, the right to due process, these are values which Canada will defend to the last. I am proud to say that in that fight, Israel is a proud friend. I mentioned the many examples in which we co-operate, but it is on the basis of these shared values that our friendship will continue to be very strong.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman will have only five and a half minutes.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan for bringing forward this motion today, allowing us to pronounce ourselves, which we will do later in a vote, on how the Iranian regime can never be trusted and denounce it for its continuous human rights violations and for the destabilizing impact it has in the Middle East today.

We have talked at length about how the Iranian regime continues to violate human rights on a scale we have not seen in years, including imprisoning Canadians, such as Maryam Mombeini, the widow of Professor Kavous Seyed-Emami, a Canadian who was murdered in Tehran in the notorious Evin prison. He was captured and then beaten to death while he was incarcerated in Iran.

We have talked about how we need to make sure that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force is not just sanctioned but listed as a terrorist organization, not just because of what it does in Iran, but because of the evil it spreads throughout the Middle East. It trains the Shia militia in Iraq, and it supports Hezbollah in Syria. It supports the Syrian army in carrying out all its genocides under Bashar al-Assad during the conflict in Syria, and it also provides the command and control for the Houthis in the destabilizing civil war that they are committing in Yemen. Never mind what it is trying to do to Israel.

Again, we have to condemn Ayatollah Khamenei for his ongoing attack by words right now against the State of Israel, how he wants to carry out a genocide against the Jewish people, and how he calls Israel a "cancerous tumor" that must be removed from the landscape of geography. He believes that the State of Israel should be pushed right into the Mediterranean Sea. That can never happen. That is why it is important that we continue to stand strong against Ayatollah Khamenei.

We have a situation where the Government of Canada is engaging in normalizing relations through the diplomatic corps with Iran and actually talking about reopening our embassy in Tehran. Two meetings have already taken place this year between high-level diplomats. People from the Iranian regime have actually been here in Ottawa meeting with Global Affairs Canada.

We cannot allow that to happen just because the government wants to do business with an organization, a country, that has carried out capital punishment, including under President Rouhani, at an alarming rate, second only to China in the number of people killed. This is a regime that continues to violate the human rights of ethnic and religious minorities. I have been talking with the Baha'i. I have been talking with the People's Mojahedin Organization and with the Kurds in Iran.

It is disgusting what is going on there now and how the regime is treating the Kurdish community within Iran. It has already isolated the Kurdish community from an economic standpoint so that it is not allowed to export or import any goods. People from the Kurdish community step forward and try to move goods over international boundaries. Those porters, called kulbars, are like Sherpas. If they are caught, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard shoots them on sight. It is not an arrest. It is not a seizure of goods. It is killing the individuals who are trying to keep food on the tables of the people in the Kurdish region of Iran. That, again, speaks to how notorious and disgusting the Iranian regime is.

We on this side of the House do not believe that we need to re-engage with Iran. We have to continue to stand strong against it. We have to make sure that it is isolated, that sanctions are maintained, and that we do not allow billions of dollars to flow back into the Iranian regime, which has allowed it to create this unholy alliance with Russia and Bashar al-Assad in Syria and cause all this heartache and turmoil in the region.

● (1825)

I have restarted, along with my friend from Scarborough—Guildwood, Canadian Parliamentarians for Human Rights and Democracy in Iran. We can work together as parliamentarians across party lines to ensure that human rights and democracy are respected, that we continue to denounce the Iranian Islamic republic, and that Ayatollah Khamenei and President Rouhani are sanctioned under the Magnitsky Law the way they should be.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): It being 6:30 p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, May 29, 2018, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1830)

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the vote be deferred until Tuesday, June 12, at the end of the time provided for oral questions.

The Speaker: The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MAIN ESTIMATES 2018-19—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the points of order raised on May 29, 2018 and May 30, 2018 by the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona regarding vote 40 under Treasury Board Secretariat in the main estimates 2018-19, also known as the budget implementation vote.

[*Translation*]

On May 29, I ruled on an earlier point of order of his regarding the same vote. In that ruling, I indicated that speakers have generally been reluctant to rule that an item in the estimates was out of order except in clear cases where the supply item had a legislative dimension and was not pure supply.

[*English*]

The hon. member, in his intervention of May 29, argued that the funds sought under vote 40 do not appear to be for a purpose under Treasury Board's legal mandate, as defined in the Financial Administration Act. Instead, it is a central fund from which Treasury Board will allocate money to other departments and agencies for them to carry out their mandates. He felt this circumvented the usual practices for supply. He also contended that this vote cannot reasonably be compared to other central funds under Treasury Board, which are all either consistent with its legal mandate or otherwise justifiable.

[*Translation*]

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader responded to this point by arguing that the hon. member's reading of the Treasury Board's mandate was too narrow. In his view, there was no question that these matters fall within the legal mandate of the Treasury Board. He also cited my earlier ruling indicating there is ample precedent for monies to be granted to a central fund.

On May 30, the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona argued that some of the specific initiatives in vote 40 lack proper legislative authority. In particular, he noted that initiatives relating to employment insurance and cybersecurity seem dependent on measures contained in Bill C-74, Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1. As this bill is not yet law, he felt it was not proper for the government to seek appropriations for its implementation.

[*English*]

Finally, given that vote 40 will fund a variety of initiatives in various departments and agencies, the member felt it problematic that the vote had been referred to a single committee, the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates. In his view, it would be more appropriate for the initiatives in vote 40 to have been

studied by the committees directly responsible for those departments and agencies.

I will deal with this last point first. When the estimates are tabled, they are automatically referred to committee in accordance with Standing Order 81(4). As is the case with documents tabled under Standing Order 32, it is the government that determines to which committee each vote will be referred. While this used to be done by motion, the Standing Orders were amended in 2001 to make the referral automatic. The minister now provides the Table with the list of committees to which separate votes are sent for study. In the case of vote 40, it was referred to the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, a committee with a fairly wide-ranging mandate on matters relating to estimates. In its study of vote 40, the committee is free to invite whomever it feels appropriate. I do not believe there is any role for the Speaker to become involved in the matching of votes and committees.

● (1835)

[*Translation*]

On the matter of the legal authority for the spending, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 873, indicates:

> The Chair has maintained that estimates with a direct and specific legislative intent (those clearly intended to amend existing legislation) should come to the House by way of an amending bill.

My predecessors have addressed this issue in a number of different rulings. Speaker Jerome, in a ruling found on page 607 of the *Journals* of March 22, 1977, explained:

> ...the government receives from Parliament the authority to act through the passage of legislation and receives the money to finance such authorized action through the passage by Parliament of an appropriation act. A supply item in my opinion ought not, therefore, to be used to obtain authority which is the proper subject of legislation.

[*English*]

Nothing in the wording of vote 40, as I read it, seeks to amend existing legislation. The hon. member acknowledged as much in his intervention. He questioned whether the Treasury Board has the legal authority to spend for the purposes of the initiatives contained in vote 40. It is clear, however, from the vote wording that the funds are to be granted to the Treasury Board so that it can transfer them to other departments and agencies. As the hon. member himself concedes, the vote wording specifically says that expenditures of the funds must be for purposes "within the legal mandates of the departments or other organizations for which they are made."

Speaker's Ruling

[*Translation*]

The hon. member's objection, really, is a matter about which department is seeking the funds. He does not feel it appropriate that Treasury Board requests money for a central fund on behalf of other departments or agencies. As I stated in my ruling on May 29, 2018, there is ample precedent for central funds. The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona cited many of these in his intervention. While he argues that vote 40 is of a different nature than other central funds, I am not convinced that Treasury Board lacks the legal authority to manage it. As the hon. parliamentary secretary argued, this would require a rather narrow reading of the Financial Administration Act. I do not believe the vote can be ruled out of order on that basis.

● (1840)

[*English*]

Again, as I indicated in my earlier ruling, it is up to the government to determine the form its request for funds will take. It is for members to decide, in studying and voting on the estimates, whether or not the money should be granted. In the case of vote 40, some members may wish that the request had been in a different form. In the end, they are left to make a decision on the request as the government has presented it. The Chair's role is limited to determining if the request for funds is in a form that does not require any separate legislative authorization and if it respects the limits of the supply process.

This brings me to the final point raised by the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona. He argued that certain initiatives do not appear to have existing legislative authority, but instead appear to be dependent on legislation currently before Parliament or yet to be introduced. Speaker Sauvé, in a ruling found at page 10546 of the *Debates* of June 12, 1981, indicated, "the Appropriation Act should only seek authority to spend the money for a program that has been previously authorized by a statute" and that, by seeking funds for programs where the legislation had not yet been introduced, the government was putting the cart before the horse.

[*Translation*]

On March 21, 1983, she addressed a similar matter. Vote 10c under Industry, Trade and Commerce in that year's supplementary estimates provided for payments under the Small Business Investment Grant Act, which was still before the House in the form of Bill C-136. In ruling the vote out of order, she stated at page 23968 of the *Debates*:

> Vote 10c clearly anticipates legislation and, in that sense, seeks to establish a new program in the absence of other legislative authority and seeks the funds to put it into operation.

[*English*]

The matter to be established, then, is whether existing legislative authority is lacking for the initiatives identified by the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona. Absent this authority, it would be premature for the government to be seeking funds. Previous Speakers have noted that it is not always easy to identify the legislative authority for particular initiatives in the estimates. Unfortunately, the parliamentary secretary, in his response, did not directly address this point. This information would have been helpful for the Chair in determining whether such authority is lacking.

The hon. member asserted that, as the budget indicated that certain initiatives would be the subject of legislation, it follows that such initiatives should not receive funding through the estimates until that legislation is passed. It is not entirely clear to the Chair, however, that these activities have been shown to lack existing legislative authority. To take, for example, the matters relating to cybersecurity, according to annex 1 of the main estimates, the funds are to be transferred to the Communications Security Establishment, CSE, which has an existing legislative mandate under the National Defence Act. While Bill C-74 does indeed provide for the transfer of certain employees from other departments to the CSE, I believe that the CSE does have a mandate under existing legislation to spend for such purposes. Were the government proposing to grant funds to an organization not yet created or for an entirely new purpose, I believe there would be a valid objection, but that does not appear to be the case in the examples enumerated by the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

I must admit that, at the outset, the matters regarding Employment Insurance caused me some concern. The main estimates themselves explain, at page I-9 and I-10:

> Costs related to Employment Insurance benefits and Children's benefits are the largest components of the items excluded from the estimates. Most Employment Insurance costs are paid directly out of the Employment Insurance Operating Account, rather than a departmental appropriation, and are therefore not specifically included in estimates.

● (1845)

[*English*]

The authority to spend funds for the purposes of paying employment insurance benefits is statutory, pursuant to the Employment Insurance Act. It is not entirely clear why this request has been included in vote 40, whether it is truly additional funds or whether the amount has been included for information purposes. Regardless, the question to determine is whether legislative authority for the request is lacking. The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona indicated that the funds were to make permanent an existing pilot project for people working while on claim. While the provisions in Bill C-74 make this change to the Employment Insurance Act, it is clear to me that there was legislative authority under the existing act for the pilot project.

While the hon. member raised important questions, Speakers have generally ruled items in the estimates to be irregular only when they clearly lacked a legislative basis or when the items themselves sought to amend existing legislation. I do not believe that to be the case with vote 40, and therefore I rule that it is indeed in order.

I appreciate the hon. member's vigilance in ensuring that proper practices are followed regarding the estimates. As this is the first time the House has been presented with a budget implementation vote of this nature, it is important to ensure that the limits of the supply process are respected. That said, I also want to remind the hon. member of my ruling of June 4, 2018, when I underscored the importance of being concise when presenting a point of order. Even on a matter as complex as the estimates, it should not require multiple lengthy interventions to make one's point. I am certain all hon. members will keep this in mind in preparing their arguments.

[*Translation*]

I thank hon. members for their attention.

* * *

FISHERIES ACT

BILL C-68—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act and other Acts in consequence, not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration at report stage of the Bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration at third reading stage of the said Bill; and

That, at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at report stage and 15 minutes before the end of Government Orders on the day allotted to the consideration at third reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George.

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here we go all over again. I am going to bring the House back to 2015, when the member for Papineau was campaigning and said that if he were elected prime minister that debate would reign, that he would not enforce time allocation. Here we are, and I believe this is the 42nd time that we are seeing time allocation, and on such an important bill.

The Liberals are saying that they are restoring and fixing Bill C-68, the Fisheries Act, which is a historical piece of legislation, because they are undoing the harmful changes that our Conservative government did in 2012. They are putting back the HADD provisions, yet they sidestep any obligation to uphold the HADD regulations in this legislation by providing the minister with the ability to exempt certain provisions. We know that the Fisheries Act is vitally important. Why is the minister trying to once again limit the debate on such an important piece of legislation for Canadians?

● (1850)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with some of the member's comments, and certainly on the importance of this legislation to Canadians. He and I may have differences on how some particular aspects of the bill may or may not work, but I certainly share his view, which is a view that Canadians have shared with us, that this is one of Canada's most important pieces of environmental legislation. It is one of the oldest pieces of legislation. I think the first bill was passed after Confederation. It has been over time one of the most effective pieces of environmental legislation, because of exclusive federal jurisdiction in so many of these areas.

It is also legislation that has allowed coastal communities across the country to develop thriving local economies, allowed Canadians to participate actively in commercial fisheries and recreational fisheries, and has obviously allowed the participation of indigenous communities in many of these fisheries. It has structured economic relations that have been important, not only for coastal communities, but for thousands and thousands of women and men who earn their living from the fishery.

We made a commitment to Canadians in the 2015 election that we would restore lost protections. My hon. friend referred to some of the changes that the previous government made in omnibus legislation which evacuated some of the important environmental protections. We restored those, but we went further by incorporating modern safeguards. We did not simply cut and paste what existed in the 1970s. We included things like a positive obligation on the government to work on restoring fish stocks that are in serious condition. We also talked about restoring and protecting habitat.

My colleague, the Minister of Public Safety, and I had an opportunity in Saskatchewan to meet the rural association of municipalities, and producers. As a result, we also included important things like codes of practice, to ensure that agricultural operations and small municipal works are not overly burdened by complying with the Fisheries Act provisions.

We tried to modernize the act in a way we think is very balanced, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will agree. I notice you are sitting on the edge of your chair. It must be because you are in profound agreement with those important statements that I have just made.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Through you, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the minister if he knew how many of these time allocations have been moved during this Parliament. However, we heard a minute ago that there have been 42.

First of all, does the minister realize that this is the 42nd time allocation motion? Also, in the last Parliament, what were his thoughts when the Conservative government made such excessive use of these time allocation motions? Did he agree with that? If not, why does he agree now? What happens to our democracy when there are so many time allocation motions in a Parliament?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Hochelaga for her questions.

I also thank the NDP for its support for Bill C-68. I had the opportunity to work with her colleague, the NDP critic. Some amendments were adopted by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, including very positive amendments proposed by the NDP. I think this is a good example of committee members working together. The suggestions made by witnesses and the examples we received from other administrations helped us strengthen and improve the bill. I am very proud of that. I thank the NDP for its important work in this regard.

The time allocation motion should come as no surprise because we made important commitments to Canadians during the 2015 election. We have worked closely with parliamentarians for several months. We conducted extensive public consultations. We held widespread consultations to get Canadians' suggestions on how we could modernize and improve the Fisheries Act.

We think the time has come for the House of Commons to vote on this important bill. What is more, we will have to wait for our colleagues in the Senate and work with them because they too need to study and debate this major bill. I hope we will be able to work with them in a very constructive manner in the fall, if the bill has reached that stage by then.

● (1855)

[*English*]

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our hon. colleague across the way talked about open and transparent ways and about consulting with Canadians. One of the issues our fisheries committee found when we were studying this was that a lot of communities and a lot of Canadians feel that they have not been truly consulted. By shuttering debate and forcing time allocation, the minister is indeed saying that all the members of Parliament on this side of the House, and all the Canadians, the electors, who elected the opposition, really do not have a say, and their views really do not matter. They are shuttering debate and not allowing all the members of Parliament to have a say on this bill.

It is interesting that the minister talks about the commitment to openness and transparency, because what this bill would also do is undermine transparency and due process by allowing the minister to withhold critical information from interested proponents. It would also give the minister sole discretion to make policy without consultation, something similar to what we are seeing with the surf clams and how that is impacting the town of Grand Bank. Bill C-68 is just another bill that would give the minister the authority to go in and make policy without consulting Canadians, and that is wrong.

Would my hon. colleague across the way not admit that perhaps shuttering debate on a bill that is so fundamental, while talking about openness and transparency, might be just a bit too far-fetched?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, it perhaps will not surprise colleagues that I do not share my colleague from Cariboo—Prince George's view that it is far-fetched. What is far-fetched are some of the assertions made by colleagues in this House that these important amendments would reduce transparency or make the act somehow less accessible. What we have decided to do in modernizing the Fisheries Act and restoring lost protections, but incorporating modern safeguards, is in fact to open it up, for example, to the voices of indigenous peoples and to incorporate indigenous traditional local knowledge in decisions made by governments with respect to stocks of fish, licensing, and other considerations.

What we have also done is ensure that this legislation is reflective of the recommendations we received from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans. I was extremely proud of the consultation the committee did and what it heard from Canadians. The committee received hundreds of submissions and heard from witnesses. The vast majority of the recommendations made by our colleagues on the standing committee, including from the opposition parties, are incorporated in this legislation.

What could be more transparent than referring the bill to a standing committee, as this House did some weeks ago, hearing from witnesses again on the actual piece of legislation, and then amending the bill to improve it, including amendments from opposition parties? That speaks to transparency but also to the desire to listen to Canadians and ensure that we get this right. That is certainly the way we have approached this legislation. I am quite confident that the vast majority of public opinion in the country will think that these are significant and overdue improvements to the act. They are certainly ones of which we are very proud.

● (1900)

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister about this bill and about calling for time allocation. I hope I am still going to get time to speak to this bill. It is a very important piece of legislation and one that we in the NDP generally approve of. We are supportive of it, but there are still problems with it and with fisheries management in Canada.

I am from the interior British Columbia, where we used to have DFO staff throughout the interior who acted as community advisers for a lot of the stewardship groups that worked on salmonid enhancement and aquatic enhancement. Those have all gone. I am very proud to say that we have the Okanagan Nation Alliance, a first nations group, that has stepped into that void and has done tremendous work. However, I am just hoping that in the future, we will see a revitalization of the DFO in the interior of British Columbia and across Canada to help with fish-habitat enhancement and fish-stock revitalization, as was done in the past before the Fisheries Act was gutted back in 2012. I wonder if the minister could comment on that.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from South Okanagan—West Kootenay for his question, and also, as I mentioned to his colleague from Hochelaga, to thank New Democrats for their support of this legislation. We have worked constructively with our colleagues in the New Democratic Party, and we certainly are committed to continuing to do so. We share a lot of the same objectives.

My colleague specifically commented on stewardship groups and the conservation and protection officers, fisheries officers themselves, who have played and continue to play, we think, a very important role in some of the small communities, including the ones my colleague referred to in South Okanagan in British Columbia. One of the things I am proud of is our government's decision to invest almost $300 million in the implementation of these new provisions, these improvements, we are pursuing with respect to the Fisheries Act. That will necessarily include the hiring of additional conservation and protection officers. They are remarkable women and men who work in small communities, and often, I have been told, in partnership with community groups and stewardship groups.

We will also be hiring some of the habitat protection officers my colleague referred to. The previous government cut almost 40% of these jobs. If one is going to evacuate and remove some of the environmental protections, why would one not just carry on and eliminate some of the staff that used to enforce those provisions? That is exactly what the previous government did. To make sure that this legislation is as effective as Canadians expect, and as we certainly want it to be, we are proceeding to hire and recruit exactly the kind of people my colleague referred to.

I would be happy to work with him and discuss exactly where these people will be located. I do not have the detailed plan yet of what particular offices will see what particular new personnel hired, but I would be happy to work with him and all colleagues in the House, once we have that information, to ensure that we get that right. We think that is going to be one of the successes of this legislation.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this bill is supposed to be about openness and transparency and balancing environmental considerations with commercial considerations, but in my riding of Sarnia—Lambton, the Coast Guard basically drove a bunch of icebreakers down, crushing the Sombra ferry crossing and killing the commercialization that was happening on both sides of the border. Even though a solution has been proposed that is environmentally acceptable, no action has been taken on the part of the government. I would ask the minister why he has taken no action.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sarnia—Lambton is referring to an unfortunate circumstance that took place some months ago, when the Canadian Coast Guard was proceeding to undertake some icebreaking activities on the American side of that particular body of water. There had been some damage that was sustained. It, unfortunately, is a matter that is private in nature. The Canadian Coast Guard does not have responsibility for those particular circumstances. We have had a chance to discuss with my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton and share with her the circumstances the Coast Guard uncovered or determined when it looked at that operation.

One thing we think is important is to ensure that the Coast Guard has all the important resources it needs to safely do the work Canadians expect of it. I am particularly proud of investments we have made in the Canadian Coast Guard. It is an iconic Canadian institution. It is a remarkable group of women and men who serve in the Canadian Coast Guard. We are committed to ensuring that they have the best tools and platforms to do the work safely that Canadians expect of them,. We will continue to invest and support the Coast Guard as it does that important work.

As my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton noted, it is important to Canada's economy. Icebreaking is probably one of the best examples of an activity that is critical to the Canadian economy and one that the Canadian Coast Guard does very effectively.

● (1905)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleague who is rising today to defend the time allocation motion moved by his government. Not so long ago, in June 2015, the minister sat with the Liberal Party on this side of the House and his colleague from Winnipeg North said the following about time allocation motions:

> The [Conservative] government, by once again relying on a time allocation motion to get its agenda passed, speaks of incompetence. It speaks of a genuine lack of respect for parliamentary procedure and ultimately for Canadians. It continues to try to prevent members of Parliament from being engaged and representing their constituents on the floor of the House of Commons.

Those were the words of the member for Winnipeg North. He is now part of the Liberal government that is once again moving a time allocation motion.

What has changed since my colleague was on this side of the House and always voted against time allocation motions? Today, he is on the other side of the House and is moving time allocation motions. I am certain that he will support this time allocation motion when we vote shortly.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Sherbrooke.

If ever there was a member to quote, I cannot imagine a better one than our colleague from Winnipeg North, an extraordinary parliamentarian with a great deal of experience in the House. He always had something to say about the previous Conservative government's abuses, for example when it prevented committees from doing their work, or when its MPs, its committee members, were given a rule book they had to follow to make sure that the committees could not function.

When I was the government House leader, I had the privilege of working with the member for Winnipeg North, who did in fact identify some of the Conservative government's extraordinary abuses of procedure. However, as he also said repeatedly, and once again I agree with my colleague from Winnipeg North, time allocation is a necessary tool in a legislator's toolbox to ensure passage of bills that are very important to Canadians and that are part of the solemn commitments we made to Canadians in 2015.

I can imagine my colleagues across the way criticizing us for not putting our agenda in place and not keeping our election promises. I am not surprised, because on one hand they do not want to help us keep an election promise we are very proud of, and on the other hand, they claim that we are not interested in listening to opposition members or working constructively with them.

I would remind my colleague from Sherbrooke that I was extremely pleased to work with his colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam on this bill. We saw the committee adopt NDP amendments and we are very proud of that. We will continue to work with all members in order to ensure that we have the best bill possible to present to Canadians, and we believe that is exactly what is happening.

● (1910)

Mr. Rémi Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must commend the work of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, his team, and his department, because since our government came to power, important measures have been taken for our coastal communities, like the ones back home in Gaspé, which depend heavily on the fisheries. The minister promised to reinvest in research, for example. Back home, in my riding, $27 million was invested in the Maurice Lamontagne Institute and in hiring more scientists. That is significant.

There were also investments made in environmental initiatives because the Fisheries Act is a major component of our environmental plan, which seeks to restore our coasts to ensure that fish can come back and restock our coasts.

Earlier, the minister talked about the consultations that were held to help modernize the legislation. I know that he consulted a number of organizations and associations. I would like him to share some of the feedback he got during those consultations.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia for his question and especially for his important work representing his constituents. I had the privilege of visiting his riding with him when he was a candidate and was hoping to earn the confidence of the voters, as he did so well, to become a member of Parliament. I saw that he was very familiar with the economic challenges and opportunities in his riding, especially when it comes to the fishing industry.

My colleague is an important adviser to me and our government, for example, on the issue of improving fishing infrastructure and wharves. In his riding, which I have visited many times, I saw the economic, social, and cultural significance to the small coastal communities of having fishing infrastructure and wharves in good condition. This infrastructure helps provide major economic opportunities for the communities.

I am extremely proud of my colleague's work on this file. He mentioned consultations. We had the opportunity to meet groups of fishers together on occasion. We also spoke to the processing industry, which employs thousands of people in coastal communities, in his riding and mine, for example. People told us they were worried that the owner-operator principle that we put in the act might be restricted or changed.

[*English*]

In English, it is the owner-operator principle.

[*Translation*]

This principle is very important to the economic future of small communities, as well as to inshore and midshore fishers, like the ones my colleague represents. This is an example of how these groups asked us to do something and we took appropriate action. I am very proud of this, and I hope that my colleagues are as well.

[*English*]

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague across the way talked about all the consultation.

I am going to go on again and again about it. Overwhelmingly, Canadians from coast to coast to coast said they felt they were not consulted. In fact, indigenous groups said that it was more of an information session, not really a consultation.

It is interesting that our hon. colleagues will talk about all the cuts that were done previously by the Conservative government, and will go on and on saying that the changes that took place in 2012 resulted in a loss of fish and fish habitat. Out of all the consultations we had as a committee and all of the witnesses who came forth, how many came forward with evidence of proof that the changes in 2012 resulted in a loss of fish and fish habitat? It was absolutely zero.

We have a lot of questions. The one I want to ask is this, and I will keep my question short. I know the minister likes to go on and on. Was the hon. minister aware that in all the consultations the fisheries committee had not one environmental group, academic, local group or department official came forward with any evidence that the changes made in 2012 resulted in any loss of fish or fish habitat? Not one witness who came before the committee offered any evidence that the changes made in 2012 resulted in any loss of fish or fish habitat.

● (1915)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, my colleague for Cariboo—Prince George talked about consultation. It is important to understand that consultations were at the core of our review prior to presenting this legislation.

The proposed amendments to the Fisheries Act were very much done with the views of Canadians in mind. For example, my department, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, consulted broadly with Canadians, provinces, territories, indigenous groups, and other stakeholders. We had two rounds of online public consultations and held hundreds of meetings with indigenous groups, stakeholders, and partners to seek their views on restoring lost protection and incorporating modern safeguards.

We received extensive feedback throughout the consultations, and I know my colleague will be extremely interested in this. For example, our department had 2,163 Canadians register online to participate in these consultations. We received 5,438 e-workbook questionnaires that were completed by Canadians. We had over 170 meetings with indigenous groups and resource management boards. We had over 200 separate submissions from indigenous groups.

The standing committee itself, as I said before, did extraordinary work and heard from 50 witnesses, held 10 meetings, and received 188 written submissions.

If we think that this legislation is so well crafted, so balanced, and so effective, it is precisely because we heard those voices that inspired us to get this right. That is exactly what we think we have done.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will share some conversations I had with some of the first terms members. They were very concerned about the actions of opposition members over the last number of weeks, that they were being obstructionists, and were delaying the whole process in the chamber. I might have joined in with that conversation and agreed with them had this not been my 18th June here. For 10 years, we were on that side of the House, in the deep, dark, gunnels as the third party. Every June, for 10 years, we did our best as an opposition to ensure that we opposed the government, and we used every trick in the book that we could. In government, one uses every tool available, and closure is one of them.

I commend the minister on this. He took the legislation to committee and accepted a great number of amendments from the NDP. However, amendments under the Conservatives were like a species at risk, because they would entertain none. Therefore, this legislation did get a great viewing.

I would ask the minister to go over the list of people who have weighed in on this, who have consulted on this, and how this stands quite differently from how the Conservatives went about their business and really showed no respect for the committee process.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, it is hard to follow our colleague for Cape Breton—Canso, because, as always, we think he has summarized exactly the essence of the problem. The previous Conservative government used every parliamentary tool at its disposition to disrupt, obstruct, and stifle debate. In fact, the Conservatives at one point had published an actual manual of how to drive parliamentary committees into the ditch. They had a whole series of steps, such as if it appeared that an amendment might be supported, this was what a member would do to ensure the committee would grind to a halt, and did not conduct any business.

We think Canadians were frustrated and upset by that. That is why we have taken a much different approach. The Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans and the work it has done on the legislation is proof positive of that point. My colleague for Cape Breton—Canso said it so very well.

● (1920)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Call in the members.

● (2000)

[*English*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 753)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Csmet	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Di Iorio
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Hardie
Harvey	Hebert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings

Iacono	Joly
Jowhari	Khalid
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lefebvre	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Morneau	Murray
Nassif	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Rudd
Ruimy	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Tootoo
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Virani	Whalen
Wilkinson	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young—169	

NAYS

Members

Albas	Barlow
Benson	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Block
Boucher	Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau	Cannings
Caron	Choquette
Clement	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Dubé	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dusseault	Duvall
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Garrison	Genuis
Gladu	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Johns	Jolibois
Kelly	Kent
Kmiec	Kwan
Lake	Liepert
Lloyd	MacGregor
MacKenzie	Maguire
Malcolmson	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Nantel
Nater	O'Toole
Pauzé	Plamondon
Quach	Raitt
Ramsey	Rankin
Reid	Rempel
Sansoucy	Schmale
Shields	Stanton
Ste-Marie	Stetski
Strahl	Stubbs
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong—80

PAIRED

Members

Duclos	Gill—2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from June 7 consideration of Bill C-68, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act and other Acts in consequence, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Churence Rogers (Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we cannot take the vitality of our fisheries for granted. The fish and seafood sector is the heart and soul of many rural coastal and indigenous communities across Canada, and indeed of my riding of Bonavista—Burin—Trinity. Fisheries provide good middle-class jobs that draw on traditions stemming back hundreds of years. However, communities need support to meet the challenges of the 21st century. That is why I am proud to support Bill C-68, which would restore lost habitat protections and modernize safeguards to the Fisheries Act.

Our government committed to helping middle-class Canadians and to growing our economy so that more Canadians can join it. The fishing sector plays a key role in rural and coastal communities. In the end, 76,000 Canadians make their living directly from fishing and fishing-related activities. In 2016, Canada exported 87 species of fish, and our total exports grew by 5% between 2016 and 2017. The total export value was $6.9 billion.

Fisheries support important middle-class jobs. Most of them, including self-employed inshore and coastal fish harvesters, are part of the middle class. Fish harvesters, particularly in Atlantic Canada and Quebec, have told us time and time again that they need help to secure their continued independence, and they need support to protect the socio-cultural fabric of their communities.

In many of our communities, the fish and seafood sector is the primary economic driver, as well as the glue that holds people together. In other words, it not only puts food on the table, it also creates fodder for conversations around the table. In coastal communities, talk around the dinner table is about fundamental questions: Will the fisheries provide a living for generations to come, the way it has for us? Can we get a decent return on our investment?

Today we are acting for future generations. Bill C-68 would restore lost habitat protections and would provide for the making of modern regulations to help sustain the fisheries for many generations to come. While Bill C-68 covers many areas, I would like to focus on how it would impact the inshore and coastal fishery in eastern Canada.

Fishing remains one of the region's main industries. In 2016 alone, it generated $2.3 billion in landed value from inshore fleets. However, these impressive numbers cannot be taken for granted. Fish harvesters in Atlantic Canada and Quebec told us that to maintain an economically viable inshore fishery, licences need to be kept in the hands of independent, small boat owner-operators, and the fish harvesters need to be the ones making decisions about and receiving the benefit of their licences.

There are currently no legislative or regulatory requirements in place with respect to the rebuilding of depleted fish stocks. The Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, along with the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, has recommended that any revision to the Fisheries Act should include direction for the restoration and recovery of fish habitat and stocks. In addition, environmental groups have also called on the government to adopt measures aimed at rebuilding depleted fish stocks within the Fisheries Act.

That is why the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans recommended improvements to Bill C-68 to strengthen the provisions on the rebuilding of stocks so that the minister implements measures to maintain prescribed fish stocks at or above the level necessary to promote the sustainability of the stock, while taking account of the biology of the fish and the environmental conditions affecting the stock. If a prescribed fish stock does decline to a depleted level, the government will develop a plan to rebuild that stock.

The government realizes that maintaining a stock or rebuilding it to healthy levels may not always be possible for environmental reasons, or in some cases because of the adverse economic effects that some measures may impose on communities.

● (2005)

However, the legislation will require that when these cases arise, Canadians will be informed and provided with the reasons. The aim is to manage fishery resource sustainability for the long-term benefit of Canadians and to help ensure long-term stability of our fisheries for current and future generations. As the Prime Minister stated, we need the right balance between the environment and the economy.

The Department of Fisheries and Oceans has policies to help maintain a strong and independent inshore fleet. These policies aim to keep the benefits from the inshore fishery flowing to licence-holders and communities that are dependent on the resource. Successive governments have recognized that a licensing regime that supports independent inshore harvesters is crucial to the livelihoods of coastal communities that depend on the fisheries.

Bill C-68 would clarify the authority to make regulations that would support and strengthen owner-operator and fleet separation policies. In so doing, middle-class jobs in our coastal communities would be protected. Specifically, clarified authorities in the act would support the development of much-needed regulations relating to the inshore fisheries.

The department would work with stakeholders on the development of regulations that would seek to strengthen the independence of the inshore fish harvesters in Atlantic Canada and Quebec. The objective of the regulations would help individual inshore licence-holders keep greater control over their enterprises and livelihoods. The regulations could also provide for strengthened rules around how licences are issued. For example, the government could strengthen support for the fleet separation policy by prohibiting the issuance of inshore licences to certain types of corporations. Once regulations are in place, the department would take enforcement actions when there is non-compliance. Licence-holders could face severe consequences, even lose their privileges to hold a licence, if they were to contravene these rules.

Ultimately, the government, through Bill C-68, is acting to create a stable and predictable environment for greater transparency, co-management, sustainability, and accountability. As the bill moves through third reading and the Senate, the government will continue to reach out to all Canadians from all walks of life for their input. The government is earning the trust of all Canadians with respect to fisheries protection.

I am proud to put my full support behind the proposed amendments to the Fisheries Act. I urge all hon. members to join with me so that we can ensure its speedy passage through the House.

● (2010)

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague gave a great speech. He had talking points. It was a speech that was probably written for him by the minister's office, but I have to commend him. It was well delivered.

The fisheries committee studied Bill C-68. There were well over 50 witnesses, as well as written submissions. Not one witness was able to produce any evidence of loss of fish or fish habitat due the changes that the Conservative government made to the Fisheries Act in 2012. Is my hon. colleague aware that not one witness was able to produce any shred of evidence that there was a loss of fish or fish habitat?

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague said, we heard from many witnesses and groups through briefs and presentations at the fisheries committee. At the same time, many of these witnesses talked about habitat protection and other things that we have identified in this particular bill currently before the House, such as sustainability and the protection of stocks like northern cod that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are challenged with. All of these issues were discussed fully, as the member knows, and recommendations came from the fisheries committee after great debate and discussion.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are many things that we like in the bill, but we have a concern that I would like to highlight.

In 2015, almost three years ago, the mandate letter sent to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard from the Prime Minister instructed the minister to act on recommendations of the Cohen Commission on restoring sockeye salmon in the Fraser River. In recommendation 3 of the report of Justice Cohen, it recommends that "...The Government of Canada should remove from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' mandate the promotion of salmon farming as an industry and farmed salmon as a product."

However, DFO continues to promote the salmon farming industry and the product. People at home do not understand how DFO can both market fish farming but also have the same mandate to protect our wild salmon.

When will the government finally act on this recommendation? Again, it is a recommendation that was set out three years ago.

● (2015)

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, as we know, there are differing circumstances across Canadian jurisdictions when it comes to fish farming and aquaculture.

Eastern Canada is very different from western Canada, and is managed with different levels of government. At this stage, we have seen some significant gains and improvements in the aquaculture industry in eastern Canada. It has created badly needed jobs in many of our rural communities.

In terms of the member's question in regards to western Canada, I cannot say that I have the information to answer it directly. I do know that when I sat on fisheries committee sessions some time ago, the commissioner identified some issues around the aquaculture industry, and they were issues that needed to be addressed by DFO. Of course, I am looking forward, like everybody else, to having some of these matters addressed.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, given the answer from the member for Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, I am changing the focus of my question to that presentation to the environment committee from our commissioner for the environment. Her report found that there was virtually no monitoring of pesticides used in open pen fish farming, no checking of transfer of viruses, and an appalling lack of monitoring and regulation.

I would just make the point to the member for Bonavista—Burin—Trinity that my knowledge of the Atlantic salmon situation is that the recovery of wild Atlantic salmon populations is imperiled by the continued presence of aquaculture salmon on the Atlantic coast as well.

I wonder if we should not get aquaculture out of DFO altogether and put it over with Agriculture and Agri-Food.

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, there are numerous reports that have been made from time to time about causes of the decline of many kinds fish stocks. One of the things we see happening now in Atlantic Canada, in Newfoundland and Labrador in particular, is the imbalance in the ecosystem in terms of the explosive growth in seal populations that are destroying not only salmon but other species in Atlantic Canada. Therefore, to attribute the cause for the decline of Atlantic salmon to one particular factor is too simplistic. There are many environmental factors that also impact Atlantic salmon numbers and other species as well.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-68, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and other acts in consequence. I would like to start by stating that the official opposition supports the protection of our oceans and fisheries. Our previous changes to the Fisheries Act in 2012 were enacted to support transparency in the decision-making process and to provide a level of certainty to those invested in that act. Unfortunately, the Liberal government is proposing amendments through Bill C-68 that add additional layers of regulatory uncertainty.

The hon. Sergio Marchi, president and CEO of the Canadian Electricity Association stated that while Canada's electricity sector remains committed to protecting and conserving our natural resources, Bill C-68 "represents one step forward but two steps back". The Canadian Electricity Association's concerns centre on the government's shortsightedness in choosing to return to pre-2012 provisions of the Fisheries Act that address "activity other than fishing that results in the death of fish" and "the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction", otherwise known as HADD, "of fish habitat".

While the Liberals say they are restoring HADD they sidestep any obligation to uphold the HADD regulations in the legislation by providing the minister with the ability to exempt certain provisions. The CEA points out, and rightly so, that virtually any action without prior authorization could be construed as being in contravention of Bill C-68.

The Canadian nuclear agency shares these concerns. In its testimony before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans it stated that the definition of fish habitat has been changed so that the term now means "water frequented by fish", while retaining the "directly or indirectly" terminology. The Canadian Nuclear Association warned that this has the potential to include waters not designated to support fish, like tailing ponds, or drainage ditches, or waters not intended to be fish habitats, or where no fish are present at any time of the year. As such, it called on the government to revise the term "fish habitat" to exclude these structures.

The Canadian Electricity Association echoed the same sentiment, seeking amendments to provide greater certainty around the definition of fish and fish habitat, focusing on fish population conservation.

Ontario Power Generation agrees. In its written statement to the standing committee it recommended that exceptions, including intake canals and other structures that were constructed for the purpose of facility operations and not intended to be frequented by fish, should also be considered.

All of this is falling on deaf ears. Bill C-68 would also result in greater uncertainties for existing and new facilities and discourage yet more investment opportunities in energy projects, something the government seems to be quite good at.

The Canadian Nuclear Association in its submission to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans stated, "the concept of 'cumulative impact' is not only a key issue with respect to the environment, but also with respect to sustained investment in Canadian energy projects".

The Canadian Nuclear Association's testimony continued, highlighting the plight of Canada's energy sector, advising that, "Right now, investment in Canada is facing significant challenges - including uncertainty caused by a suite of changes to federal and provincial regulatory policies, trade restrictions, corporate and individual tax rates". This regulatory uncertainty is shared throughout industry.

The Canadian Electricity Association recommends that the minister be required to consult with any jurisdiction also exercising potentially duplicative, overlapping, or conflicting orders. Regulations are important. No one in any industry in Canada would refute the need for regulations. However, it makes no sense that a company has to go through the same regulatory conditions at every level of government simply to satisfy duplicate regulatory conditions. This costs time and money, and ultimately it costs investment opportunities.

This is at a time when the U.S. President's tariff action against Canadian steel and aluminum remains unfair and a serious threat to workers across the country who rely on this industry to put food on the table for their families, at a time when, according to Statistics Canada, the total foreign direct investment in Canadian oil and gas extraction slumped 7.4% in 2017, down to $162.2 billion.

● (2020)

That is due to a hasty retreat by international oil producers last year, including massive divestment by Royal Dutch Shell, about $9.3 billion, and ConocoPhillips, about $17.7 billion, totalling nearly $30 billion.

The government's carbon-tax scheme threatens to increase the cost of living for every Canadian, emphasized by the new report recently released by the Parliamentary Budget Officer. It found that the Liberal carbon tax will take $10 billion out of the Canadian economy by 2022, while other estimates argue that it could be as much as $35 billion per year, hurting jobs, workers, and families.

The current Liberal government is compelled to introduce bills like Bill C-68, which would add layers of regulatory ambiguity, adding massive uncertainty in an already turbulent investment climate. When will the government realize that investment opportunities are highly perishable prospects?

Bill C-68, like other bills, such as Bill C-69, appears to undermine transparency and due process by allowing the minister to withhold critical information from interested proponents, which runs contrary to the Prime Minister's promise of a more open and transparent government.

The act would require the minister to take into account indigenous knowledge and expertise when it was provided, and all decisions would have to take into account the possible impact on indigenous rights. However, that knowledge would be protected from being revealed publicly, or even to a project's proponents, without explicit permission from the indigenous community or the people who provided it.

The government has announced $284 million in new money to implement and enforce the new law through the hiring of new fisheries officers to enforce the act and educate people about it. There are, however, no timelines or details on when and how many officers would be hired. This bill would allow for the establishment of advisory panels and for members to be remunerated. However, there is no guidance or limitation on their use.

Bill C-68 would expand the reach of a prohibition against anything that alters or impacts fish habitat to all waters where fish exist. As the member for Cariboo—Prince George indicated earlier, the goal of the Fisheries Act is and should remain to protect and enhance Canada's fish stocks while avoiding any unnecessary negative economic impacts on industries that rely on access to Canadian land and water. In 2012, the Conservative government improved fisheries conservation, prioritized fish productivity, protected significant fisheries, and streamlined an overly bureaucratic process. The current government, though, through Bill C-68, would revert to rules that caused confusion, were difficult to enforce, and that negatively impacted farmers, communities, and resource development. The only real winners here would be regulatory lawyers, who would reap the rewards of Bill C-68.

I have no doubt that my colleagues across the way will question our commitment to the preservation of fish habitat. I have said before that we clearly support the protection of our fisheries and oceans. What the current government fails to understand is that they can protect the environment and have responsible resource development. It only makes sense to protect fish habitat if they want a robust fisheries economy, and that is what the current Fisheries Act does.

It is my hope that the government will continue consulting with industry on fish-habitat restoration plans moving forward. The government's knowledge and appreciation for the protection of fisheries is essential. We will continue to work closely with fishers, farmers, industry groups, and communities to ensure that their questions are heard.

I would rather be having a longer debate instead of being under time allocation, but this is the situation we are in. I look forward to questions from my hon. colleagues.

● (2025)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question for my hon. colleague is simple. Does the member believe that the Kinder Morgan pipeline should continue if it puts fish and their habitat at risk?

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from my friend across the way and his commitment to reducing plastics in our oceans. That is something to be commended, and I thank him for all his efforts. He is doing a great job.

Canada's regulatory processes, when it comes to our natural resources, are some of the most strict in the world. In fact, we have some of the toughest environmental and labour standards anywhere in the world. That is for good reason, because we want these projects, when the proponents apply, go through the process and check all the boxes and meet all the regulatory hurdles, to see approval at the end of that process.

Unfortunately, as we are seeing with the Trans Mountain project, the Prime Minister, although he approved the project, failed to go down to British Columbia when the premier was sworn in and explain how the process was going to unfold. Now all sides have dug in on their respective positions. We have seen a lack of movement. Now we are at the point where we have a pipeline that is nationalized, which is not in the best interests of taxpayers.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the standing committee. We looked very hard at the changes the previous government made to the Fisheries Act to understand what it was trying to achieve, to keep the things that obviously made sense, and to make adjustments where we saw problems.

One problem came up from the previous legislation, and I wanted to hear the member's comments on this. The previous legislation provided protection to fish that were important commercially, to the recreational fishery, and to first nations. However, it left open the possibility that if something happened and a stock collapsed and was no longer a viable piece of any of those three activities, it would in fact no longer be protected. It would actually fall off the table. Perhaps that is what we would have seen, for instance, with northern cod, as a good example.

Can the hon. member comment on a change he would make to try to prevent that scenario from playing out?

● (2030)

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my speech, there need to be certain regulations and processes in place. They are there for good reason.

I echo the concerns of the Canadian nuclear agency in its testimony before the House of Commons. What it had problems with was that the definition of fish habitat would be changed to now mean "water frequented by fish" while retaining the "directly or indirectly" terminology. That means that it would have the potential to include waters not designated to support fish, such as tailing ponds, drainage ditches, and waters not intended to be fish habitat. We all know that mines use tailing ponds and other companies use those types of things. If these new regulations were in place and we were trying to encourage investment, at the end of the day, all costs of any product or service a company was offering would be rolled into the final price. If the final price exceeded what the market was willing to pay, that product would not be manufactured or taken from the ground and mined.

When the cost of doing business is increased, it hurts investment. It hurts the economy and the jobs that go with it.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can put this to the hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock.

Is he aware that we had the Fisheries Act from 1868 until 2012 protecting fish wherever they were found? Is he aware that the protection of fish habitat was put in place under the former Trudeau administration by the right hon. Romeo LeBlanc? All the economic development that happened in Canada was never thwarted by protecting our fish.

The destruction of the Fisheries Act by Bill C-38 in 2012 was a scandal, and this repairs it.

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words from the leader of the Green Party, but I do not share her sentiment that it is a so-called "scandal". I will remind the hon. member that in committee, not one witness mentioned that there was a loss of fish or fish habitat as a result of the changes made in 2012, not one.

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-68 following the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans' review and analysis of this bill.

We thank the committee members for their careful study of this legislation and their thoughtful amendments. During this review of Bill C-68, my colleagues in committee heard from many different witnesses and experts. I would like to take this time to talk about what they heard. I would also like to share the concrete steps proposed to make improvements and move forward with this legislation.

From the environmental NGO community and members across the aisle in the Green Party and the NDP, the committee heard about the importance of water flow for fish habitat. The government supported the associated amendments put forward in committee.

The committee also heard from industry groups seeking amendments to the rules proposed for the processing of applications for habitat authorization during the transition from the current to the new legislation. In response, the committee adopted the amendment to provide clearer transition provisions.

The committee also heard about strengthening the federal government's legal obligations when major fish stocks are in trouble. This is why the committee proposed the inclusion of requirements, under the legislation, that the minister sustainably manage or rebuild fish stocks that are prescribed in regulation. However, the legislation would require that when such cases arose, Canadians would be informed and provided with a rationale. Our aim is to sustainably manage fisheries resources for the long-term benefit of Canadians.

As members know, in 2012, the previous government decided to change habitat protection without the support of or consultation with indigenous peoples, fishers, scientists, conservation groups, coastal communities, and the Canadian public. In contrast, our government has worked with all Canadians and has encouraged everyone to be part of this process. The proposed amendments to Bill C-68 are part of our government's broader review of environmental and regulatory processes under Bill C-69, an act to enact the impact assessment act and the Canadian energy regulator act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, which was reviewed by the committee.

The Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development also adopted some important amendments, which have been reflected in Bill C-68. These include better protections for indigenous knowledge and clearer transition provisions that would ensure better business continuity.

The changes proposed in Bill C-68 would support several government priorities, such as partnering with indigenous peoples; supporting planning and integrated management; enhancing regulation and enforcement; improving partnership and collaboration; and, finally, monitoring and reporting back to Canadians. This is transparency.

This bill would include the reintroduction of the prohibition against the harmful alteration, disruption, or destruction of fish habitat as well as the prohibition against causing the death of fish by means other than fishing. There are measures to allow for better management of large and small projects that may be harmful to fish and fish habitat through a new permitting scheme, for big projects, and codes of practice, for smaller ones.

The amendments would enable the regulatory authorities that would allow for establishing a list of designated projects, comprising works, undertakings, and activities for which a permit would always be required. We have been, and will continue to be, engaged with indigenous peoples, provinces and territories, stakeholders, and others to capture the right kinds of projects on the designated project list.

Habitat loss and degradation and changes to fish passage and water flow are all contributing to the decline of freshwater and marine fish habitat in Canada. It is imperative that Canada restore degraded fish habitat. That is why we proposed changes to the Fisheries Act that would include the consideration of restoration as part of project decision-making.

● (2035)

The bill is motivated by the need to restore the public's trust in government, which was lost following decisions made in 2012.

In order to re-establish the trust of Canadians in government, access to information on the government's activities related to the protection of fish and fish habitat, as well as protecting information and decisions, is essential. We listened and we proposed, through Bill C-68, measures to establish the public registry, which will enable transparency and access. This registry will allow Canadians to see whether the government is meeting its obligations and allow them to hold the government accountable for decision-making with regard to fish and fish habitat.

The addition of new purpose and consideration provisions will more clearly guide the responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard when making decisions and provide a framework for the proper management and control of fisheries, and for the conservation and protection of fish and fish habitat, including by preventing pollution.

Fisheries' resources and aquatic habitats have important social, cultural, and economic significance for many indigenous peoples. Respect for the rights of the indigenous peoples of Canada, taking into account their unique interests and aspirations in fisheries-related economic opportunities and the protection of fish and fish habitat, is one way we are showing our commitment to renewing our relationship with indigenous peoples.

We listened to Canadians on the need for modern safeguards. That is why we have proposed changes to the Fisheries Act that provide a new fisheries management order power to establish targeted fisheries management measures for 45-day increments where there is a threat to the proper management and control of fisheries or to the conservation and protection of fish. This will help to address time-sensitive emerging issues when a fishery is under way and targeted measures are required.

Proposed changes to the Fisheries Act include a new ministerial authority to make regulations to establish long-term spatial restrictions to fishing activities under the act, specifically for the purpose of conserving and protecting marine biodiversity. This will support our international commitment to protect at least 10% of our marine and coastal areas by 2020. Proposed changes also include authority to make regulations respecting the rebuilding of fish stocks.

As I mentioned earlier, our government reached out to Canadians to help put the bill forward. We listened to the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development and the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans and provided direction for the restoration and recovery of fish habitat and stocks. We were pleased with the amendments of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans during its clause-by-clause review. We listened to environmental groups, and the committee proposed provisions aimed at implementing measures to promote the sustainability of the major fish stocks.

In addition, in keeping with modernizing the act in line with other federal environmental law, changes are being proposed to the Fisheries Act to authorize the use of alternative measures agreements.

Through Bill C-68, the Government of Canada is honouring its promise to Canadians. By restoring the lost protections and providing these modern safeguards, the government is delivering on its promise as set out in the mandate letter from the Prime Minister to the Minister of Fisheries.

Since introducing this bill, we have heard support from a broad range of Canadians for these amendments that will return Canada back to the forefront when speaking about fish for generations to come.

I urge all hon. members on both sides of the House to join me in supporting this bill, which is so important.

● (2040)

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am from Saskatchewan and I have a brief here that was presented to the committee by the Saskatchewan Mining Association.

The government has said that balancing the environment and the economy can and will be done. However, the brief comments on how SMA members had worked previously with Fisheries and Oceans Canada on the topic of habitat banking, resulting in the 2012 publication entitled, "Fish Habitat Banking in Canada: Opportunities and Challenges". As such, they support the addition of proponent-led habitat banking into the amended act. In this regard, when considering the cumulative effects of the work undertaken or activities, the net gains in habitat should be fully considered.

Mosaic's K3 potash mine is located in my community. It is very important to our province. It is very conscientious. Two full-time environmental people are on staff. With the legislation, the government would be removing the opportunity the company had with net habitat gain to offset what it would impact in the company doing what it needed to do to keep the livelihoods of Saskatchewan people at the forefront, while protecting the environment at the same time.

Would the member not say that there should be full consideration of net habitat gains through habitat banking or offsetting when we are considering the cumulative—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook.

Mr. Darrell Samson: Mr. Speaker, this bill brings forward protections for our fish stock and fish habitat as well as our government's initiative on the oceans protection plan, the super-clusters, and what not. We are putting those protections in place to ensure the safety of our species.

It is important to note that the Conservative government took out those protections and safeguards in 2012. It is those types of gestures that really underline the problematic issues we are trying to correct today.

● (2045)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, reconciliation should be a part of all legislation and the federal government's commitments to implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People and working in true nation-to-nation relationships with Canada's indigenous people should be consistent with the Canadian Constitution and should be reflected in the Fisheries Act.

Keith Atleo addressed federal staff in Ahousaht. He told them that DFO was served notice because Ahousaht felt that it was not adequately consulted about the changes to the act.

Our party supports the bill, but I have concerns, and I shared them with Mr. Atleo. He said that the word "may" consult first nation and "may" recognize first nations rights was disheartening. He asked if DFO was wasting its breath around the table if the minister "may" consider what the Ha'wiih, which is the hereditary chiefs of the Nuu-chah-nulth, were saying.

Does he believe it is "may" or does he believe we should be implementing the rights of indigenous people?

Mr. Darrell Samson: Mr. Speaker, I am so glad my colleague touched on consultation. Over the 10 years of Conservative government, it did not consult in any way, shape, or form. When the former prime minister visited a province, he would not even let the premier know. That was disrespectful.

With respect to indigenous people, a large majority of them support the pipeline, for example. We are not going to get 100% support. What is important to note is that the minister will have the authority to enter into any agreements with indigenous people, and this is in the bill as well. They will not be consulted but they will be part of the solution, and that is really good when it comes to what we are trying to accomplish as a government.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak tonight to Bill C-68, the new Fisheries Act. Although I grew up, and still live, far from the coast, my family has deep history in coastal fisheries. My mother's family, the Munns, once controlled the cod fishery of Labrador. My great uncle William Azariah Munn was what one might call a cod liver oil baron. Luckily, my mother hated the stuff so much that she did not force it on me and my siblings.

Getting back to the bill, the bill comes from a Liberal promise in the last election campaign when both the NDP and Liberals ran on platforms that included the repealing of Conservative legislation that gutted all of the environmental protections of federal legislation. We are very happy the Liberals have finally acted on this, although I am not sure why it took so long.

The bill would finally restore protection for all fish across Canada. When I say all fish, I would like to point out that under the previous Conservative legislation, all fish were not created equal. Only those fish that were part of a commercial or indigenous fishery were protected, and they were not protected as strongly as they were in the past. I am happy that some of our rarest and most vulnerable fish species, like the speckled dace of the Kettle River, are now protected in this manner once again.

In the past, the Fisheries Act was the strongest piece of legislation that actually protected habitat in Canada. As many here know, I was a biologist in my past life, and I spent a long time working on ecosystem recovery plans and species at risk. Time and again, my colleagues would point out that the only legislation, federal or provincial, that effectively protected habitat, was the Fisheries Act. As a biologist who worked on land, I was always a bit jealous of my fisheries colleagues since there was little or nothing that had the same power of protection for terrestrial habitats.

This habitat protection was at the core of earlier versions of the Fisheries Act. The Conservatives took this habitat protection out in 2012 through Bill C-38, one of their omnibus budget bills. This action resulted in a huge public outcry, and among the voices were four former fisheries ministers, including one of my constituents, Tom Siddon, a former Conservative fisheries minister. He wrote an open letter to the government, urging it to keep habitat protections in the act.

This new act is still deficient in a few ways regarding habitat. For instance, while it talks about the water in rivers and lakes as fish habitat, it does not discuss the amount of that water. That is clearly important. Increasingly, low water levels in our rivers and lakes are causing difficulties for fish. Many of our fish require good quantities of clean, cool water, and more and more often they are faced in late summer with low levels of warm water that can be lethal to fish, especially to salmonids.

This act also does not address the habitat conflict between wild salmon stocks and the practice of open-net salmon farms. We should be moving in an orderly fashion toward closed containment farms to isolate fish health issues caused by the farms that impact wild salmon stocks under the open-net regime.

Bill C-68 empowers the fisheries and oceans minister to make management orders prohibiting or limiting fishing to address a threat to the conservation and protection of fish. Of course, I am fully in favour of this power, but I wonder how often it would be used, despite the fact that it would likely be recommended on a regular basis by scientists.

Fish are consistently treated differently from terrestrial species in conservation actions. As an example, of all the fish species assessed as threatened or endangered in recent years by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, less than half have actually been placed on the Species at Risk Act schedules. If a terrestrial species is in trouble, it is generally added to the list as a matter of course. However, but if a fish is in trouble, it is out of luck. This attitude has to change.

As well, the bill would give a lot of discretion to the minister to make decisions based on opinion rather than on scientific evidence. This practice must be limited and only used in exceptional circumstances. I am always concerned when it is enshrined in legislation and seemingly encouraged, as it is here and in other recent legislation, such as Bill C-69 on environmental impact assessments.

I am happy there is a provision in this act to give the DFO more resources for enforcement. I hope some of those resources can be used to rebuild the DFO staff that used to be found throughout the British Columbia interior to promote fish habitat restoration and rebuilding fish stocks.

● (2050)

There are no DFO staff left at all in the Okanagan and Kootenay regions now, despite the fact that there are numerous aquatic stewardship societies across my riding that used to have a great relationship with DFO and its work, and which benefited from that work. Volunteer groups that are devoted to aquatic habitats on the Arrow Lakes, the Slocan Valley, Christina Lake, the Kettle River watershed, Osoyoos Lake, and Vaseux Lake would all benefit through a renewal of those staffing levels. They talk to me regularly about that, and that they miss that help.

I would like to close with a good-news story that shows what can happen when Canadians take fish conservation into their own hands, identify the problems and solutions, and then work hard to make good things happen. That story is the restoration of salmon populations in the Okanagan. This story involves many players and funding from the United States as well as Canada, but it is mainly a story of the Okanagan Nation Alliance, ONA, the first nations of the Okanagan, who came together to bring salmon back to the valley.

Salmon, or n'titxw, is one of the four food chiefs of the Okanagan peoples, and is central to their cultural and trade traditions. When I was a kid in the Okanagan, salmon were in very low numbers. The Okanagan is part of the Columbia system, and those fish had to climb over 11 dams to get back to the spawning grounds. Most of the Columbia River salmon runs died out, but a few sockeye came back to the Okanagan every year, though maybe a only a couple of thousand in some years. However, after years of work by the ONA and other groups, we often see runs of over 100,000 fish. The Okanagan River is once again red with sockeye in the autumn. The ONA has taken an ecosystem-collaborative restoration approach that combines cultural ceremonies and salmon feasts with technical restoration. They work collaboratively with provincial and federal authorities, and everyone in the region has benefited, with recreational fishery openings, an increase in licence revenues, and local salmon to the public. I enjoy the sockeye out of Osoyoos Lake every year now.

This approach has enabled the ONA to grow to one of the largest inland first nations fisheries organizations in Canada. It has 45 full-time staff, which is probably 10 times the staffing level of DFO in the interior of B.C. It has its own hatchery, biology lab, habitat restoration course, and courses that are even taken by DFO staff.

However, even though they have been working collaboratively with DFO, they have still identified some serious issues to me.

First, there is a need for a harvest sharing agreement between Canada and the U.S. There is no agreement in place to ensure minimum food fishery requirements for first nations, and there is no other place in the Pacific region where there is up to 150,000 salmon harvested between Canada and the U.S. that does not have such an agreement in place.

Second, ONA has asked for support for the Columbia River Treaty renewal and the importance of Canadian salmon. Okanagan salmon are the only Columbia River salmon returning to Canada, and they are directly affected by how Canada stores water in its treaty dams.

Third, it points out the need for support for ONA's salmon restoration in the upper Columbia, which is in the Kootenay region. There are no salmon there now. ONA submitted a proposal to DFO and asked the minister back in September 2017, but it has received no response.

Fourth, the ONA regrets to see the overall exclusion of first nations at the Columbia River Treaty table, which is something that is very important to them.

To conclude, we will be supporting Bill C-68, but there is clearly still a lot of work to be done to protect our fish and our fisheries.

● (2055)

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his presentation today. I certainly know the area well, particularly Osoyoos Lake. I want to compliment specifically the efforts of the Okanagan Nation Alliance in bringing sockeye back to that ecosystem.

The member mentioned that there was a growing amount of support both at the federal level and at the Okanagan Nation Alliance. It is my understanding that the previous provincial government was not supportive of these efforts to bring back sockeye to Okanagan Lake. I wonder if the member has had any conversations with the Province of British Columbia, with the new NDP government there, and whether or not it is going to be part of the positive change to bringing back that species to Okanagan Lake.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Mr. Speaker, I have not talked to the provincial agencies about the question of introducing the sockeye salmon back to Okanagan Lake. It is the final step in the local plan to bring back salmon to the Okanagan Valley. I know they have introduced salmon fry to Okanagan Lake, and there is an ability for those fish to return through that dam, but I do not know what full support the provincial government might have. I know there has been a lot of concern, because we have kokanee stocks as well that are the same species. There are issues around mysid shrimp, so kokanee stocks are vulnerable in many ways. That introduction will be continuing at a careful and slow pace.

One thing that impresses me about the ONA is their dedication to science. They are going about this in a very careful and scientific manner.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I want to revisit some of what happened in Bill C-38 in 2012. I was not able to put this question to a Conservative member.

The language that was inserted in the Fisheries Act, only protecting fish if they were commercial fish, aboriginal fish, or recreational fish, was language that came straight from a briefing note from the Canadian Electricity Association. It did not come through DFO scientists, did not come from experts; it came from an industry lobby group. It was nothing I had ever seen in Canada. It reminded me of the Bush administration. It put 80% of the 71 freshwater species in this country that are under the Endangered Species Act without any protection at all.

I was not a witness before the committee; I was never able to answer a member's question. However, in my riding, constituents call me all the time about certain stocks that are being overfished or clam beds being overharvested, where they could not get DFO to act because it did not have the resources, and did not have the impetus for fish habitat protection because of the changes made in Bill C-38.

● (2100)

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, the member mentioned a number of issues. One was the removal of the habitat provisions of the old Fisheries Act. There was the de-staffing. That was something we certainly felt in the interior of B.C. DFO literally vanished from the Okanagan and Kootenays. That staff had been very important in helping local groups with habitat restoration, which is at the core of bringing back a lot of these stocks that have suffered.

The member also brought up the direct action based on a request from an industry group, without perhaps listening to the other side. A lot of local people are very concerned about fish habitat. They are not interested in hearing that our fish will be sacrificed to try to restore some habitat somewhere else. There are a lot of issues that have come up in the last few years that have concerned a lot of people, and they are very happy to see this habitat and other protections restored.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak to Bill C-68, especially after having come back from committee. I know that my colleagues on committee did an outstanding job. They brought forward some thoughtful amendments, and I believe we have a good piece of legislation. During the review of Bill C-68, my colleagues in committee heard from many different witnesses and experts. I would like to take the time to talk about what they heard, and the concrete steps they proposed to help further improve this legislation for the benefit of all Canadians.

The changes proposed in Bill C-68 support several government priorities and key themes: partnering with indigenous peoples, supporting planning and integrated management, enhancing regulation and enforcement, improving partnership and collaboration, and monitoring and reporting back to Canadians. Canadians want to know what is taking place within the fishery. This bill includes the reintroduction of the prohibition against the harmful alteration, disruption, and destruction of fish habitat, as well as the prohibition against causing the death of fish by means other than fishing. There are measures to allow for better management of large and small projects that may be harmful to fish or fish habitat, through a new permitting scheme for big projects, and codes of practice for smaller ones.

The amendments would enable the regulatory authorities that would allow for establishing a list of designated projects comprised of works, undertakings, and activities for which a permit will always be required. We have been engaging and will continue to engage with indigenous peoples, provinces, territories, and stakeholders to ensure that we capture the right kinds of projects on the designated project list. Habitat loss and degradation, and changes to fish passage and water flow, are all contributing to the decline of freshwater and marine habitats in this country. It is imperative that Canada restore degraded fish habitats, and that is why the proposed changes in the Fisheries Act include consideration of restoration as part of the project decision-making.

This bill is motivated by the need to restore the public's trust in government, which was lost through the changes made in 2012. In order to re-establish that trust, access to information on the government's activities related to the protection of fish and fish habitat, as well as the project information and decisions, is essential. We listened. We proposed, through Bill C-68 measures, to establish a public registry which will enable transparency and access. This registry would allow Canadians to see whether their government is meeting its obligations, and allow them to hold the government accountable for decision-making with regard to fish and fish habitat. The addition of new purpose and consideration provisions would clearly guide the responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard when making decisions and providing a framework for proper management and control of the fisheries for the conservation and protection of fish and fish habitat, including by preventing pollution.

Fisheries resources and aquatic habitats have important social, cultural, and economic significance for many indigenous people. Respect for the rights of indigenous peoples in Canada, taking into account their unique interests and aspirations in fisheries-related economic opportunities and the protection of fish and fish habitat, is one way in which we are showing our commitment to renewing our relationships with indigenous people.

We listened to Canadians on the need for modern safeguards. That is why we have proposed changes to the act that would provide new fisheries management order power to establish targeted fisheries management measures for 45-day increments, where there is a threat to the proper management and control of fisheries, or to the conservation and protection of fish. This would help to address time-sensitive emerging issues when a fishery is under way and targeted measures are required. This tool might be used to assist in our current protection of the North Atlantic right whale. Proposed changes to the act include a new ministerial authority to make regulations to establish long-term spatial restrictions to fisheries activities under the act, specifically for the purpose of conserving and protecting marine biodiversity.

• (2105)

This will support our international commitment to protect at least 10% of the marine and coastal areas by 2020. Proposed changes also include authority to make regulations respecting the rebuilding of fish stocks.

As I mentioned earlier, our government reached out to Canadians in developing the bill. We listened to the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development and the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, and provided direction for the restoration and recovery of fish habitat and stocks. We are pleased that the standing committee has offered amendments during its clause-by-clause review to improve the bill in this regard. We listened to environmental groups, and the committee proposed provisions aimed at implementing measures to promote the sustainability of major fish stocks.

We also heard from Canadians on other important issues. We have proposed amendments to the Fisheries Act that would prohibit fishing for a whale when the intent is to take it into captivity, unless circumstances so require, such as when the whale is injured, in distress, or in need of care.

In addition, in keeping with modernizing the act in line with other federal environmental law, changes are being proposed to the Fisheries Act to authorize the use of alternative measures agreements. Alternative measures agreements are designed to effectively address contraventions of the act without the need to engage in costly and arduous court processes. Alternative measures agreements are a formally recognized resolution process designed to address offending behaviour. The process focuses on redressing the damage and addressing the root causes of the contravention. Alternative measures agreements provide a cost-effective alternative to the criminal justice system and have been shown to reduce recidivism.

We have been clear on our commitment to make inshore independence more effective. That was a considerable issue in the last Parliament, and I have heard about this issue from Port Morien to Port Hood, all the way down to Little Dover. Proposed changes provide specific authority in the Fisheries Act to develop regulations supporting the independence of inshore commercial licence holders and enshrine into legislation the ability to make regulations regarding owner-operator and fleet separation policies in Atlantic Canada and Quebec.

Through Bill C-68, the Government of Canada is honouring its promise to Canadians. By restoring lost protections and providing modern safeguards, the government is delivering on its promise, as set out in the mandate letter from the Prime Minister to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard. Since the introduction of this bill, we have heard support from a broad range of Canadians for these amendments, which will return Canada to the forefront of protection of our rivers, coasts, and fish for generations to come.

I mentioned the hard work of the committee and how its efforts have made a good bill even better. The committee heard about the importance of water flow for fish habitat from the environmental NGO community, members across the aisle, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, as well as the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam. The government supported the associated amendments put forward in committee. We believe they will contribute to the effective management of fish habitat.

In Bill C-68, we strengthened the federal government's legal obligations when major fish stocks are in trouble. The committee built on this by proposing the inclusion of requirements, under the legislation, that the minister sustainably manage or rebuild fish stocks that are prescribed in regulations. Of course, we realize that this may not always be possible for environmental reasons, or because of the adverse economic effects some measures may impose on communities.

Again, I want to thank the committee. This is a good bill made better by the amendments that were proposed by the committee. I look forward to questions from members.

• (2110)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to let the member know that we support this bill, but I have some concerns.

The NEB recently ordered Kinder Morgan to stop installing plastic anti-salmon spawning mats in eight B.C. rivers. These plastic mats are still in place. They are destroying salmon habitat.

Does the member think that the minister should intervene and order Kinder Morgan to stop damaging our critical salmon habitat?

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: Madam Speaker, on that specific issue, I am sure that the minister is aware of that. I am sure he will pursue that particular issue.

Not just the minister, but certainly members from British Columbia and the west, and anybody who has spent any time on the fisheries committee, know how important the salmon stocks are, not just to the coastal communities but to the entire province of British Columbia and to Canada.

When I was on the fisheries committee, and I have been back and forth a number of times during my time in the House, we discussed the aquaculture initiative, the on-land aquaculture industry. There are credible scientists sort of pitching both, some stating that land-based is the best way to go, and a different cohort with scientific information stating that it does not really hurt the wild salmon.

There is an amazing amount of contradictory science. However—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I do have to allow for more questions. Maybe the member will be able to finish later.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to follow up on that discussion of expert opinion.

I know the hon. member was in the House at the time the Harper government revamped the Fisheries Act and took out those protections. Does he not remember that around that time a letter circulated, signed by at least over a hundred experts, not to say hundreds, aquatic biologists and so forth, including people like Dr. David Schindler, who lamented the withdrawing of these protections?

How does the member square those concerns and protestations with what the Conservative opposition is saying, that the removal of these protections is really no big deal?

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: Madam Speaker, the member was in the House when that took place in 2012, as well.

I think we can agree that with the last government, for 10 years, there was so little consultation with the Canadian public, with stakeholders and people who relied on the fishery. However, this is not just exclusive to the fishery or the environment. We can look at employment insurance, the temporary foreign workers file, or immigration. One thing the Conservatives lacked was any will to engage with stakeholders and people impacted by their legislation.

I think that this lack of consultation and lack of understanding of how to have better legislation by involving those who deal with it on a daily basis is probably one of the many things that hurt the former Conservative government.

● (2115)

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Madam Speaker, that was an extraordinarily adequate speech. I appreciate that.

When there was consultation, one thing we heard so much about was assistance for municipalities, because the legislation that was in place was causing so much difficulty for them. They were the people we were listening to in 2012.

I am just curious whether the member has talked to municipalities about what the added pressure is going to be based on these changes.

Mr. Rodger Cuzner: Madam Speaker, when we speak to municipalities, they do not usually get around to that because they are so excited about the amount of money we have invested in infrastructure, for clean water, water treatment plants, and green infrastructure. It is tough getting them past that level of excitement they have right now with the infrastructure investment.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise this evening with some serious concerns with respect to Bill C-68. While one might think that fisheries legislation would impact only our coastal communities, in actuality this legislation would increase costs for every single town, city, and rural municipality across this country from coast to coast.

That is why it is unfortunate that the Liberals have once again moved time allocation on this very complex and important piece of legislation. By refusing to give us the time necessary to debate this bill, they are, in essence, muzzling Canadians across Canada by refusing to give them a voice through us as members of Parliament who have been elected to represent them in this place. The Liberals have shut down debate on a major overhaul of our Fisheries Act, which will have a huge impact on farmers and municipalities across Canada, as well as on our natural resource development sector. The Liberals have consistently refused to listen to stakeholders, and now they are refusing to listen to parliamentarians. By way of doing that, they are refusing to listen to Canadians.

The Liberals have reintroduced an incredibly onerous provision of the Fisheries Act. This is the blanket prohibition on any work that could cause the death of any fish. As the explanation document on the Department of Fisheries' website spells out, "Fish habitat means water frequented by fish and any other areas on which fish depend directly or indirectly in order to carry out their life processes, including spawning grounds and nursery, rearing, food supply and migration areas." According to this, fish do not even need to be present in order for this act to apply, which of course is problematic.

I live in Lethbridge, southern Alberta. There is no ocean or a commercial fishery within close proximity. However, my region relies extensively on water management through a system of irrigation channels, reservoirs, and catchment areas. This legislation means that a farmer who so much as changes a ditch on his or her property that is somehow connected to a waterway will be impacted by this legislation. These farmers would have to apply for a permit in order to make any changes to their land. Therefore, the penalties are beyond onerous. The federal government could charge someone up to five years after the work has already taken place.

Family farms are not extravagant operations that can afford a full-time environmentalist or compliance officer within their operation. Therefore, if farmers have to apply for permits every time they take a tractor out to dig a ditch or deepen a slough, we can imagine how difficult it would be for those individuals or those operations to follow this legislation. They will have to worry about whether or not some activist animal rights group will come after them and attack them for taking their tractor out and digging a ditch on their own property in order to accomplish something that is necessary within their operation.

Farmers are among the strongest conservationists on the planet. They are among the people in Canada who advocate and act, a key word here, most strongly in favour of the environment. These are women and men who are doing a whole lot of good for our country, yet the legislation that is before the House would actually punish them. It demonizes them, and that is not fair.

This was an unprecedented year for flooding in both British Columbia and the Maritimes. Large municipalities and small rural communities alike are now realizing the need to significantly invest in flood prevention works. Whether that is as simple as building a higher dike or building dry channels to redirect flood waters at peak times, these works will now cost significantly more money to complete because municipalities are now going to have to hire an army of lawyers, consultants, environmentalists, and so forth, in order to uphold this legislation.

Testimony from Manitoba Hydro provided to the fisheries committee clearly stated that the 2012 changes to the Fisheries Act enhanced and broadened the act's protections for fish and fish habitat by adding the word "activities". In describing the true effect of the 2012 changes to the act, which this bill is trying to reverse, Gary Swanson of Manitoba Hydro stated:

> [T]he addition of the word "activities" in the prohibition against serious harm to fish arguably represents greater protection for fisheries, as do the addition of requirements for reporting all incidents of serious harm, the duty to intervene to address impacts, the extension in the time limitation for laying of charges from two to five years, and the establishment of contravening conditions of licence as an offence.

● (2120)

Let us put that in simple terms, shall we? There is much less certainty as to what this act applies to, which means it is great for lawyers but really bad for small businesses. It means it is great for environmentalists, but it is really bad for municipalities. It is really bad for Canadians, period.

Now the result will be a bureaucratic gridlock as thousands of permits are filed for. However, then it will end up being known that those permits actually are not even required. There will be this process that is incredibly onerous.

The previous Conservative government simplified this legislation because the complete prohibition of any potential harm to any body of water that might possibly host a fish was just simply unworkable. The Conservative approach focused on protecting commercial, recreational, and aboriginal fisheries. That approach focused on reducing significant harm to fish populations where they actually lived. That allowed for a proper balance between protecting fish in our waterways and ensuring that small businesses had the legal certainty to carry on their work and run a profitable business.

Proposed section 8 of this bill also sets out the establishment of fees for quotas, and proposed section 14 would establish the setting of fees for conferral. What does that mean? It means more fees that Canadians will have to pay for permits and authorizations.

Section 14 of this bill proposes powers for the creation of fees for regulatory processes with no parameters for who might be charged and how much they might be charged. It means higher costs for everyone, for them, for us, for every single Canadian. It means less money in the pockets of Canadian families because it means increased taxation. Municipalities will have to raise their taxes in order to apply for the permits that they require to do the work that needs to be done. As a result, small businesses will have to raise their prices because they will have to apply for permits, go through bureaucratic bodies, jump through hoops, and cut through red tape, in order to do their projects. This is on top of all the tax increases that the Liberal government has already placed on Canadian families, which is to say nothing of the carbon tax that is still to come.

The government has repeatedly stated that this bill is necessary to restore so-called lost protections. My colleague, the hon. member for North Okanagan—Shuswap, has submitted an Order Paper question, asking the government for proof of harm resulting from these so-called lost protections a number of times now. In its response to this Order Paper question, the government said that it cannot produce any proof because the department does not have the resources or the mandate to make such determinations. This is very interesting. This bill is the solution to a problem that has not been proven to actually exist, at the government's own admission. It is ridiculous. It is absolutely ridiculous.

The minister claimed that there were face-to-face consultations when he appeared at the committee on November 2, 2016. An Order Paper question response, dated March 22, 2017, contradicted this by stating that no face-to-face consultations had taken place. In this place, in the House of Commons, we are not allowed to call something a lie or call someone a liar. I will say that the minister certainly told an untruth.

Furthermore, we have concerns with the bill's proposals for the establishment of advisory panels. There is no accountability. There is a blank cheque being signed over, and what will they accomplish?

In conclusion, this legislation overreaches from even the pre-2012 version of the legislation. It includes the ability for indigenous groups to provide secret testimony directly to the minister that cannot be challenged by the person applying for the permit. It also creates a host of paid positions, to which the Liberal minister can appoint his friends with very little actual work required, and no accountability mechanism in place. Combined with the changes to the environmental assessment legislation, it effectively means the end of natural resource development in Canada. On top of that, it adds legal uncertainty to every Canadian, from logger to farmer to miner, about whether or not they are in compliance with the law.

● (2125)

I stand today in this place totally opposed to this legislation because it is bad for Canadians.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Lethbridge for laying out how terrible Bill C-68 is, and in particular, how it will unfairly impact our municipalities, especially those in rural Canada.

When I was first elected back in 2004, one of the things I heard from my municipalities over and over again was that they had to deal with the fish police from DFO, and how that slowed down their ability to clean ditches, replace culverts, and provide proper drainage on agricultural lands. What we are doing here is going to duplicate what the provinces already do at home.

I want to thank my hon. colleague for standing up for rural Canada, and standing up for farmers and ranchers, and for all the hard work she does in working alongside the municipalities in her region, because this legislation is terrible.

Ms. Rachael Harder: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the work my hon. colleague does in standing up for Canadians, and in particular, those who are in the rural regions.

It is absolutely vital that we stand with the women and men who farm in this country. Agriculture is the backbone of Canada, which should be an agricultural superpower. The way to become even more powerful in what we do in this country, and the way to empower our egg producers to become better at what they do, is through effective policy. Better yet, it is often done by taking policy away and doing away with the red tape.

Let our farmers, ranchers, and egg producers do what they do, and let them do it the best way they know how. Let them conserve the land, look after the environment, and produce for this country, because they will do it incredibly well. They do not need the government to get in the way.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I always welcome young women to this place, and especially young women with grit and determination, like the young member for Lethbridge. I regret that I disagree with everything she said this evening about Bill C-68.

I do not know if she is aware, but in 2012, the national organization representing municipalities in this country, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, urged the Harper government to remove the sections from Bill C-38 that would weaken the protection of fish habitat. By the way, the motion that was brought forward on the floor of the FCM convention came from none other than a former Conservative fisheries minister, the hon. Tom Siddon, who also joined in an open letter denouncing the weakening of fish habitat protection, which was also signed by another former Conservative fisheries minister, the hon. John Fraser. Bill C-38 was an egregious attack on the fisheries resource.

The fisheries resource and agriculture resource need not be in conflict, and in Bill C-68 they are not.

● (2130)

Ms. Rachael Harder: Madam Speaker, that was a statement and not a question. Clearly, my hon. colleague and I disagree when it comes to this issue.

With regard to the legislation before the House, I would reiterate once again that this is going to impose a whole slew of red tape and regulation in an area where really it is not necessary. It is going to impose significant costs to municipalities and businesses, and it is also going to result in a whole lot of uncertainty with regard to business expansion and advancement. Right now, in Canada, we do not need any of that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague ended her speech by saying that the bill would mean the end of natural resource development in Canada.

Could she give us a little more context on that statement? Did any experts or witnesses say the same thing?

[*English*]

Ms. Rachael Harder: Madam Speaker, Canada is an incredible country, full of natural resources.

Governments have two ways of generating revenue: one, they can tax it from the people; or two, they can develop natural resources. That is how governments can generate revenue. Therefore, if governments choose not to develop natural resources they are opting instead to tax people more. Canadians should not be taxed more when we have natural resources available to us. The development of those natural resources results in schools, in hospitals, and in social programs. Natural resource development is a must for every single Canadian citizen.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Madam Speaker, I see that the debate is slowing tonight. I thought I had a few more minutes to prepare, but I am happy to speak about my concerns in relation to Bill C-68.

A number of my colleagues have raised the troubling situation that we are debating a fisheries bill. It has some provisions related to fish habitat. There have been some great comments, including from an NDP member who has some experience as a biologist. That is when our debates here are at their best. Unfortunately, this debate is also under a cloud, considering that the Ethics Commissioner has now added the fisheries minister to the list of ministers of the Liberal government whose actions are going to be examined. It is with respect to the awarding of a fishing-related licence. It is unfortunate, because that is a cloud hanging over this debate.

I have heard on several occasions many members of the Liberal Party suggesting that in a previous government, fisheries management and fisheries licences did not take into consideration aboriginal treaty rights and aboriginal participation in both the traditional fishery and the commercial fishery, despite the fact that evidence shows that this is not true. If we look at some of the press releases and media advisories in relation to fishery licence competitions or proposals and requests for groups to bid, the consultation with and participation of first nations communities was part of that. It is unfortunate that some members, including the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, are making suggestions that are not supported by a cursory examination of what was happening in the last government, and that concerns me.

Bill C-68 is before the House under the cloud of yet another minister being examined for ethical conduct with the awarding of a fisheries licence to a group of proponents that did not have a boat but had a number of connections, both deep and familial, to the Liberal government. That seemed to eclipse consideration of any experience actually on the sea.

As someone who did fisheries patrols with our navy and with our air force on the Flemish Cap, I am proud of our heritage fishing and the fishers engaged in the practice. It is a hard living. As my colleague from British Columbia, our friend the fisheries critic, has highlighted the tremendous work of Canadians, they should know that any group has the ability to bid for these licences, because it is a monopoly. This is a serious power the government has, and now the fisheries minister is the third minister to be examined for how he has used that power.

The first minister to be examined was actually the Prime Minister, the first in both ways. He is the first minister. The finding of his investigation, as we know, was guilty. There is one outstanding investigation involving the finance minister, and now there is the fisheries minister. We cannot forget that in considering this legislation.

There are also two other big parts of Bill C-68 that should concern Canadians. Not only do we already think there is a cozy relationship, with some of the most recent fisheries proponents who were awarded a contract by the minister having close Liberal ties, but the government is enshrining that in Bill C-68 with paid advisory boards to advise the minister. Why is that?

The minister has a department that has done that quite well for over a century, in combination with consultations with stakeholders, industry groups, unions, and first nations. Why this new advisory board needs to be employed and paid and staffed is beyond me. It reminds us of the Liberal approach of surrounding themselves with more friends to tell them that they are doing a great job. They are not, and we are going to hear from the Ethics Commissioner on that.

The minister will have the ability to withhold critical information from bid proponents. Considering everything that has gone on, that should concern Canadians as well.

I am going to speak for the third time, with the remainder of my time, about ideological creep, once again, with the Liberal government enshrining directly the precautionary principle into legislation with very little to no debate. I have raised this before on the Oceans Act and the classification of marine protected areas and its basis. I raised it a few weeks ago with respect to the Federal Sustainable Development Act, and here we are today with the Fisheries Act, another very strategic placement of the precautionary principle.

● (2135)

In proposed section 2.5, "Considerations for decision making", the first consideration is listed as "(a) the application of a precautionary approach". That is listed along with a number of grounds. The precautionary approach and the precautionary principle are the same thing.

What is also listed in the considerations for decision-making? This is the government that, when in opposition, used to always talk about science-based and evidence-based decision-making. What does it list in decision factors the minister can take into consideration? The precautionary approach is proposed subsection 2.5 (a). The third consideration, 2.5 (c), is "scientific information". I guess it is going to have to look at that. Proposed subsection 2.5(d) is "indigenous knowledge"; 2.5 (e) is "community knowledge"; 2.5(g) is "social, economic, and cultural factors"; and 2.5 (i) is "the intersection of sex and gender with other identity factors".

This is about fisheries and decisions related to fisheries. Beyond science, beyond the people who fish, and beyond our first nations, that should be the factor in decision-making. There is the creeping edge of the precautionary principle, and now we have intersectionality, another political measure, being inserted into this. I am astounded.

Any time there was a decision made in relation to advancing projects related to resource development or other things, the Conservatives were accused of ideological underpinnings driving to support business and tear down environmental considerations. That was not the truth. Certainly we wanted certainty for proponents, but this is now the third bill on which I am talking about a direct ideological approach being embedded in legislation that is not even rooted in science.

I have said before that the precautionary principle being the guiding force has been criticized roundly, in fact, by one of President Obama's most senior advisers, the White House chair of regulatory affairs, Professor Cass Sunstein. He wrote, which I have quoted a few times, "the precautionary principle, for all its rhetorical appeal, is deeply incoherent." Why is that? It is because it allows people to make decisions based on a hunch, based on a concern, based on a "we had better act", or as some people have described it, better safe than sorry.

What was talked about when this principle was first advanced, back at the Rio climate conference? It was suggested at that point that it could only be considered when there was serious or irreversible harm demonstrated before precaution might come in. Now the government, through many pieces of legislation, without much serious scrutiny, I might add, apart from the Conservatives raising it from time to time, is embedding the precautionary principle and a list of cultural, social, and other factors where it can make decisions related to the sustainability of fisheries. It is preposterous, and it should concern people. It is giving the Liberals enough wiggle room to do whatever they want based on how they feel.

Where does this come from? One of the big groups pushing for the precautionary principle to govern and actually supersede science was the World Wildlife Fund. We certainly know where its former head is working now. He is the PMO lead. It should concern Canadians that those approaches and those things advocated for are now being systematically put into legislation without any serious discussion, and directly contrary to what science suggests. They are not even putting in an approach that irreversible harm should be the standard before this approach is used.

Liberals are, by stealth, providing an ideological approach to make decisions without scientific certainty. When it comes to our fisheries, we should be proud that under a Conservative government, John Crosbie, we remember, made a tough decision about the cod fishery, based on science, in the face of people protesting and threatening harm, because it was based on science, not on a hunch and not on ideology.

This is the third bill. Canadians should wake up to how ideological and unscientific the government is.

● (2140)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member has risen before and talked about the issue of why the government is rushing legislation through. I have had the opportunity to listen to a number of Conservative speakers. The common thread is that they do not support this piece of legislation, contrary to many hours of consultation, the hundreds of individuals who were involved in bringing forward this legislation, and even the support of other parties. The Conservatives are out of touch with what Canadians have to say on important legislation such as this.

My colleague is somewhat critical. When I was in opposition, I remember saying at times that we need to use the tool of time allocation. In fact, I suggested that sometimes the opposition does not want to push through legislation. I would be interested in the member's thoughts, because I often hear him quoting me saying that time allocation is a bad thing. What he never cites are the times I said that time allocation is a necessary tool. This is a good example. Here is great legislation, yet the Conservatives do not want to recognize it, and if it were up to them, it would never come to a vote.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I really enjoy my friend, the deputy House leader for the Liberals, because he certainly has a recollection of his time in opposition that runs contrary to mine and runs contrary to *Hansard*. I would invite Canadians to search that member's name with the term "assault on democracy". I think I recall him foaming at the mouth on a few occasions when he uttered that when an omnibus bill or time allocation, or sometimes both, were used.

Two weeks ago, he helped to do this three times in one day, setting a record. Finally, he suggests that we are out of touch, when we want first nations, fishers, and scientists to be the three key decision-makers in our fisheries, not an enumerated list of precautionary ideological principles: social, economic, and cultural. Why are the Liberals afraid of science? Unmuzzle our scientists. I would like that member to stand in the House and start the unmuzzling.

● (2145)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I would like to correct something in the present tense about Bill C-68 and correct some revisionist history. The hon. John Crosbie, fisheries minister at the time, closed down the cod fishery after it was gone. It was officially gone. National Sea Products and Fishery Products International could not find any fish, and at that point, there was a cod moratorium. The minister of fisheries at the time ignored the pleas from inshore fishermen that the fishery was going to collapse.

I would go to the present tense, and what needs correcting is the idea that the precautionary approach has been put on a high pedestal in Bill C-68. I would refer the member to the language in proposed section 2.5. That list of considerations he read out are not mandatory conditions of action. It says, "the Minister may consider, among other things", then that long list is there. It is hardly tying the minister's hands, and it does not make sure that every decision is guided by the precautionary approach. This is good legislation, and it is about time we passed it. I do agree that it should not be passed under time allocation.

Hon. Erin O'Toole: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend, the leader of the Green Party, weighing in. I am not surprised by her position on the precautionary principle, because she came from an environmental law background as an activist lawyer. We may agree on some things. We may disagree. However, I would refer her to the fact that back when it was discussed in Rio, irreparable harm was the consideration before this non-certain, unscientific approach would be advanced, the better-safe-than-sorry approach. What concerns me now is that it is in a list of enumerated grounds, including social and economic and the intersection of sex and gender. I am not sure what those things have to do with preserving fish stocks, but it shows that the government is ideological, and it is doing things not based on science.

This is not the first time I have raised this. This is the third piece of legislation in about six months that, by stealth, is inserting a principle that is still quite controversial. I quoted the most cited American legal scholar, Professor Sunstein, who is very concerned about this approach. In fact, his latest book on the subject is called *Laws of Fear*, based on this principle.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is a very interesting discussion and there have been some good speeches this evening.

I will start by saying there are two pieces of federal legislation aimed at protecting the quality of Canada's fresh water. These laws implement Ottawa's clearly stated constitutional jurisdiction and responsibility in two specific areas: navigation and the fishery. I am speaking of the Navigation Protection Act, formerly the Navigable Waters Protection Act and soon to be renamed the Canadian navigable waters act by virtue of Bill C-69, which passed at report stage today and is on its way to passing at third reading. The second piece of legislation, of course, is the Fisheries Act. These two laws are really the basis of federal water policy. Often water policy comes more out of provincial jurisdiction, but the federal government has something to say about water policy, and it is through those two main pieces of legislation.

Navigation and fishing were key aspects of life at the time of Confederation and remain significant today in our diversified modern economy. This is no doubt the reason that jurisdiction for both navigation and the fishery were given to the central government, this plus the fact that, as Pierre Trudeau famously said, "Fish swim," which means they cross provincial boundaries, as do marine vessels for that matter.

Based on the speeches I have heard here and on what I know to be the Conservative narrative, it is fair to say the Conservative opposition does not see these two laws broadly as environmental laws. This is despite the fact that both laws govern and protect the aquatic environments on which vessels traverse and in which fish live. The Navigation Protection Act and the Fisheries Act are part of a grouping of four federal laws that are the basis of federal environmental policy in Canada, a grouping that includes the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, which ... ing renamed the impact assessment act under Bill C-69, and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, which has just gone through its five-year legislative review at the environment committee under the very able stewardship of the member for King—Vaughan.

It was the Navigable Waters Protection Act and the Fisheries Act that the Harper government targeted for revamping in order to restrict their scope and significance for the environment. The Harper government amended the Navigable Waters Protection Act twice, including at one point changing its name to the Navigation Protection Act. The first time it restricted the act's scope was in a 2009 omnibus budget bill, and the second time in a 2012 omnibus budget bill.

I know members find it hard to believe that the Conservative government would ever do that, but yes it did use omnibus budget bills and they were not necessarily encompassing only financial matters. The 2012 omnibus budget bill by the Conservative government removed broad Fisheries Act protections for all fish habitats, stipulating that the act would from then on only prohibit "serious harm to fish that are part of a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal fishery, or that support such a fishery".

Incidentally, Prime Minister Harper and the Conservative government used the 2009 omnibus budget bill, if I am not mistaken, to also weaken the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, which is why the government had to bring in Bill C-69 to strengthen environmental assessment in Canada and to regain the trust of Canadians regarding the federal government's commitment to protecting the environment.

I know the Conservatives are unhappy with government budget bills when they have too many pages, and call them omnibus bills, but there is no comparison—Madam Speaker, you will recall, you were in the House—to the blatant manner in which the previous government stretched the meaning of budget bill to effectively cover everything from banks to canoes and sailboats to trout, shellfish, and crustaceans. That is what the Liberal platform objected to: the Harper government's semantic elasticity with regard to the notion of a budget bill.

● (2150)

Bill C-68 rolls back the changes the Harper government made to the Fisheries Act. As has been mentioned by others, the bill protects all fish and fish habitat. The definition of "serious harm to fish" is also being removed.

Those carrying out projects would be generally responsible for avoiding harmful alteration, disruption, and destruction of fish habitat. However, when proponents are unable to completely avoid harm to fish, an authorization permit with conditions may be issued by the minister to allow a project to proceed without contravening the act. I wonder if the opposition is critical of this ministerial discretion, given its criticism of ministerial decision-making power in Bill C-69.

It is important to note the distinction in Bill C-68 between designated projects and routine projects. I have not heard that distinction mentioned on the other side. Designated projects would always require ministerial approval. These are of course expected to be large-scale projects. Currently, under the bill the previous Conservative government was responsible for, projects requiring authorization are determined on a case-by-case basis, which adds complexity and uncertainty for business.

As for routine smaller projects, published codes of practice would provide advice to proponents on how to avoid project impacts on fish or fish habitat. Although the regulations defining designated projects have not been created, I imagine irrigation canals or flood canals on farms would not be considered major, large-scale projects, like dams. I believe they would be considered routine projects, and farmers could just avail themselves of a guide of best practice and do the best job they possibly could. There is a bit of fearmongering on the other side about what the impact of the bill would be on farmers, who are indeed very much the backbone of a large part of the Canadian economy.

Laws are all well and good, but enforcement is always the key. The government will invest $384.2 million to ensure the capacity to enforce the Fisheries Act. Among other things, this money would go toward increasing the number of front-line fishery habitat officers.

Also worth mentioning, Bill C-68 would empower cabinet to make regulations for the rebuilding of fish stocks. It would also empower the minister to make regulations for the purposes of the conservation and protection of marine biodiversity. Again, I am curious to know whether the opposition objects to ministerial discretion in these cases.

Significantly, the bill requires that the government consider the rights of indigenous peoples and traditional knowledge when making decisions about fish habitats. This supports the government's priority on reconciliation with Canada's indigenous peoples.

Finally, Bill C-68 would ban the capturing of whales, dolphins, and porpoises for the purpose of keeping them in captivity. This should be welcomed by those who hold to the protection of marine wildlife. They are people like the beluga specialist, Dr. Pierre Béland, who is the world's most well-known expert on the beluga whale, and who was actually involved in an aqua-hacking conference in Toronto this past weekend. Aqua hacking is a process by which we look for solutions to problems, like pollution affecting our waterways.

Lastly, it is worth noting that extensive consultation was undertaken to arrive at the measures we are debating today. There have been two rounds of online public consultations, and over 100 meetings with partners, stakeholders, and indigenous groups. In 2016, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans asked the House of Commons Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans to review the previous government's changes to the act. This review resulted in 32 recommendations, which helped shape Bill C-68. This is on top of all the debate that took place in 2012 around changes to the act undertaken within the context of a rather egregious so-called budget omnibus bill.

● (2155)

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a little rich for our colleague across the way to point fingers at the former government, saying how it rushed legislation through, how it did not consult, and that the Liberals are doing things differently.

I will go back, and I have said this time and again in this House, to when the member for Papineau campaigned in 2015. He said that he would let the debate reign. He said that omnibus bills would be done with, and that he would not be using them in terms of trying to force legislation. However, I believe this marks the 42nd time the Liberals have moved time allocation on a piece of legislation.

I am going to bring this back to a point our hon. colleague mentioned. The member talked about ministerial authority. I will use a recent example to show where our concern is: surf clam quota. The minister has just arbitrarily gone in and expropriated 25% of the quota under the guise of reconciliation, and we know that is not true now.

Could our hon. colleague maybe understand a little of our concern with the minister having this all-knowing, huge authority to be able to go in and implement policy without consultations?

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Madam Speaker, it is ironic that the member refers to the attitude of "all-knowing". I sat in the previous Parliament, and I remember that attitude radiating from this side of the House, to the extent that little consultation was done on many important pieces of legislation.

In terms of the Fisheries Act, we have been debating this since 2012, when the previous government introduced environmental change as part of a budget bill. I think we have had extensive consultation. Ministerial discretion is really about governments making decisions. We all agree that governments should be making informed decisions, and that is what the government is doing.

● (2200)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, Joshua Laughren from Oceana said:

> To realize the Act's potential, it must clarify the goal of restoring populations to abundance and be backed by new regulations that ensure robust rebuilding plans are developed.

My question and the concern that I would like to share with the hon. colleague is that, where I live in the Somass River and in Clayoquot, the government promised that it would deliver coastal restoration funds to rebuild our fish. In fact it has given nothing to those communities, in terms of coastal restoration: zero. There is no way that they can rebuild those stocks without support from the government. These critical investments have not taken place.

I would like to hear the member speak about a plan that would identify critical species at risk and ensure that the government is investing in bringing back our fish and bringing us back to abundance.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Madam Speaker, indeed, I am sure there are some very important measures and very important budgets that will need to be determined in the future.

However, we are talking about the legislation. The regulations have not even been crafted yet. The hon. member is right to provide his input for the eventual shaping of regulations and budget plans.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in the last speech made by the member across the way, he spoke about the GBA+ analysis done on this piece of legislation being ideological, basically saying that it was virtue signalling and there was no real point to it.

I just want to add that Amnesty International's 2016 report found that energy projects in northeast B.C. had unintended consequences for wellness and safety with a disproportionate impact on women. The Parkland Institute in Alberta said the same thing.

There are various impacts that affect women, people of a different race, and indigenous people very differently. I wonder if my hon. colleague could speak to the government's commitment to ensuring that there is a GBA+ analysis on every piece of legislation.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Madam Speaker, the reason we need analysis is that we do not know ahead of time what the impacts could be. We look at what they could be, so that we can avoid unintended consequences.

In terms of the idea that stating the need for equality is somehow ideological, I do not think so. I just think it is a principle of our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege for me to stand this evening to speak to the bill.

I will take a bit of a different approach because I am from Saskatchewan. As has been mentioned, our lakes are beautiful. We have wonderful fish and all kinds of animal life. It is very pristine and beautiful. We are also a major agricultural source within the country, as well as natural resources.

The Conservative Party of Canada supports the protection of our oceans and fisheries. Our previous changes to the Fisheries Act were enacted to support transparency in the decision-making process and to provide a level of certainty to those who had an investment in this. It is important to note that we were very robust in our expectations in determining whether environmental conditions were being met. However, we worked with the natural resource and the agricultural communities.

The term "the environment and the economy go hand in hand" does not belong to the current government. Back in 2009, that is the exact term I used to express Conservative values when I was running in for nomination. There is no question that on this side of the floor, the environment and the economy are both important, which is why our prime minister understood that Canada's role on this issue had to include a global look at the world. Canada has a responsibility in relation to the rest of the world, not just for the environment but for our economy as well. That is where our ability to work with the environment exists. Some people cannot afford to make a living. More and more we find ourselves in a situation, where investment is running out of the country as fast as it can. We are losing jobs. We cannot compete with the United States. We cannot afford to do a lot of the things that we want to do as a country to ensure our economy is strong while at the same time our environment is strong.

When I was a brand new member of Parliament two and a half years ago, one of the first visits to my office was a young man from an environmental engineers group. I could not say exactly which group it was as I was in a bit of a daze. However, we had an amazing conversation. He said, knowing what was coming from the the government and the likelihood of changes to this very act, that what we had was very good. It was very robust, very challenging, there were huge expectations, and it provided a level of certainty.

We kept hearing how the government just rushed these things through. I did not appreciate what he said to me at the time, but I do now. Certainty enabled resource producers to know the parameters under which they would be working. They hired environmental engineers like himself to ensure they did absolutely everything they could to be prepared to be to meet the requirements for their new projects. His perspective was that certainty made all the difference in the environment and the economy being able to go hand in hand.

That is the case in my riding where we have potash development at this very moment. There is a circumstance there where habitat would be be influenced by the productivity. I have a news flash. It does not matter what we do, whether it is build a house, build a downtown store, put in a new farm building, or whatever, we impact our environment. However, the concept of offsets, which the Saskatchewan Mining Association referred to in its brief, is very important.

● (2205)

It said that it had worked previously with Fisheries and Oceans Canada on the topic of habitat banking, resulting in the 2012 publication "Fish Habitat Banking in Canada: Opportunities and Challenges". As such, it said that it supported the addition of proponent-led habitat banking into the amended act. Why? The current government would say that it is because it is this evil group that wants to destroy our environment, which is ridiculous. The truth of the matter is that it wants to be responsible. I know it spent millions of dollars in securing other land as the habitat that would be protected to ensure that its business could grow and people all across our province and our country could be employed. We need that balance. I do not see that balance at all with the government.

With Bill C-68, the Liberals have added additional layers of regulatory uncertainty.

We have heard a lot tonight about the impacts on the farmers and how that will deter them in a lot of ways. My fellow member, I believe the member for Foothills, spoke to this issue a while back. He talked about how fish would be found because of floodwaters or whatever and all of a sudden these drainage areas would have to be made into bedding areas for fish, and how difficult that would be for the farming community. The member across the floor, I believe it was a member from Prince Edward Island, said that he was sure that would be dealt with at committee, that it was common sense. That is not what I am hearing from the government at all. The member from across the floor said that it was common sense to enable the Prairies and places where this was overreach to be considered in the bill. Apparently, that will not be the case.

The Liberals have said that they are restoring the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat prohibition, yet they have sidestepped any obligation to uphold the HADD regulations in the legislation by providing the minister with the ability to exempt certain provisions. How will they decide which ones they will exempt and which ones they will not? That is a dangerous place to be. We know Canadians look at what is done in the House and know what politics do. We have already heard tonight about the circumstances where this is being abused. I even wonder about the water systems that will be put in our first nations, which are under water advisories. This is a really good thing. It needs to be done. I have small communities all over my riding that need that as well. What kind of advanced research was done on the implications of putting those systems in? We need to have fairness across the board.

I want to mention one more thing. We are having trouble getting this pipeline built, yet today there was an announcement that stated, "Voisey's Bay Underground Mine Construction To Begin This Summer". This is in Labrador. Obviously, it is a priority to make that happen. It states:

> Three former Liberal premiers were on hand for the official announcement this morning...[and the] agreement was signed.
>
> The project is expected to result in 1,700 jobs...$69-million in tax revenue for the province.

It is an ore mine. However, somehow we cannot get this pipeline built to the coast to enable our provinces, which have wonderful resources, to make a difference in the Canadian economy, and to do it in an environmentally-friendly way. I am very proud of my province. We have a lot to show and teach the government about good environmental standards.

● (2210)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to reiterate the question I asked. The member for Durham indicated that intersectionality with this project was unnecessary, that it was the virtue-signalling of ideology. I want to quote the University of Calgary Faculty of Law. It referenced Amnesty International reports that found that energy products in northeast British Columbia had unintended consequences that disproportionately negatively affected indigenous people, particularly indigenous women, reducing their housing security, increasing rates of violence, and increasing spiritual harm. The Parkland Institute found that women in Alberta have not benefited from the growth in the extractive sector as men have.

Does my hon. colleague not feel that a gender-based analysis-plus is necessary to ensure that when we look at these projects and how intersecting groups fit into benefiting from them, that we understand how they might be negatively impacted and that we look at solutions to ensure the reverse happens?

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall: Madam Speaker, I am very proud of being a woman in Canada. There is no question that it does not matter what one does. There are negative consequences for absolutely everybody. I am tired of the picking and choosing that goes by that side of the floor. The truth is that we need to do many thing as a society to enable people to succeed. That is our responsibility.

When it comes to mining, I am very proud of the women who are involved in the mining industry in my province. Canada is leaps and bounds ahead of so many other countries. When we take that kind of an ideology and use it to force other countries to change their laws and their values, just the way the government uses attestations in our country to try to determine what Canadians value should be, that is out of line.

● (2215)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, my friend for Yorkton—Melville and I do not agree about the legislation. It is good legislation that repairs the damage done by the previous government. Bear in mind that we had the Fisheries Act since 1867. We have had habitat protection for decades and more. It did not stall the Canadian economy or block projects.

However, I want to make the point that the Kinder Morgan pipeline still does not have legal permission to proceed. The National Energy Board's 157 conditions have not yet been met. The company, which is now walking away from the project, never even asked the province of B.C. for 600 of the permits it still needed.

On the other hand, the nickel mine that was announced as an underground mine in Labrador by Voisey's Bay, now owned by the Brazilian company Vale, was widely supported locally, including the Innu people and the Inuit people of Labrador. There is no comparison whatsoever to a project that is opposed by most of the first nations along the route, opposed by the province of British Columbia, opposed by the alliance of British Columbian municipalities, and throughout British Columbia and remains something that coastal communities do not want. There is no comparison.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall: Madam Speaker, I agree that we do not agree.

The challenge is that the government is failing in every way to see this project through. The majority of Canadians, the majority of people in British Columbia, and the first nations groups involved in the production of this pipeline want it to take place. They are being held hostage by poor government and environmental groups that are sending their dollars into our country to impact our communities and create disruption. There is no way the government should be bowing its head to that. That is why we are in the circumstances we are in today with that pipeline.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise to speak on Bill C-68, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and other acts in consequence. As members can imagine, as a coastal British Columbian, I understand the importance and significance of protecting our fish. Where I live, it is not just our food security, our economy, or our culture, but it is integral to everything and is what connects us. It is even in our language. As saltwater people, fish and the protection of fish is given utmost priority. We always say that the health of our fish and our salmon is a reflection of the health of our communities. The importance and significance of this bill would restore the act that needs to be put in place as soon as possible so that we can protect our fish and bring ourselves back to abundance.

One of the key changes made to the Fisheries Act in 2012 that removed protection for fish and fish habitat, and that will be restored, is the harmful alteration and disruption or destruction of fish habitat. It goes further by restoring the definition of fisheries to include all fish. However, it still does not address the conflict mandates, which Commissioner Cohen identified, of conserving wild salmon while protecting harmful salmon practices. This was in the mandate letter to the Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard. The Prime Minister himself instructed the minister to act on the recommendations of the Cohen commission on restoring sockeye salmon stocks in the Fraser River.

In recommendation 3 of his report, Justice Cohen recommended, "The Government of Canada should remove from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' mandate the promotion of salmon farming as an industry and farmed salmon as a product." DFO is still continuing to promote salmon farming, its industry, and the product. We are concerned that the government has not followed through with this promise. It is impossible for the government to be an agent and also promoting an industry that might have detrimental impacts and effects on our wild fish. The goal and mandate of DFO should be restored to that of just protecting wild salmon and wild fish. New Democrats would like the government to follow through with the promise it made in the 2015 election campaign and that was outlined in the Cohen commission.

It has not done that, and it is something that is raised repeatedly. In fact, the Pacific Salmon Foundation just came out against open net salmon farming. Many groups in my riding are raising concerns about the impact it is having. Many indigenous communities in my riding are raising concerns around the impact of salmon farming. We would like that to be split out so that we can make sure DFO is doing its historic job of advocating for and protecting our fish. That is not happening now, and it is not in this legislation.

It is the first time that rebuilding of depleted fish stocks has been included in the Fisheries Act. However, details on rebuilding this will be in regulations. Those regulations need to be strong, with timelines and targets, and it needs to take into account the impacts of climate change and species interactions. We know in my area that climate change is real. In 2014, it was so dry—and then rained just in time, in August—that we were worried we would lose all of our fish as the streams ran dry at the time when the fish needed to spawn upstream. It is important that is integrated in the legislation, but also setting clear targets and necessary investments. The government keeps talking about its oceans protection plan and its record investments in coastal restoration, but in fact we are not seeing that on the ground.

As I said earlier, the Somass River still has no coastal restoration funds. It is expecting about 350,000 pieces of sockeye salmon this year, which is well below the average of just over a million and the high of 1.9 million. How do we get back to abundance? We need to make adequate investments, and we are not doing that. The salmon industry in British Columbia brings in well over $1 billion, yet we do not even invest $50 million in that sector. As a former business person, I know that is far from adequate in terms of investment in an industry that is so critical to British Columbians, in tourism, the commercial sector of fishing, the recreation sector, and for food security.

● (2220)

It feeds many people, especially indigenous people who rely on that fish, people living in poverty. It is important that the government backs it up with real investment. The bill states the following:

> require that, when making a decision under that Act, the Minister shall consider any adverse effects that the decision may have on the rights of the Indigenous peoples of Canada recognized and affirmed by section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, include provisions respecting the consideration and protection of Indigenous knowledge of the Indigenous peoples of Canada, and authorize the making of agreements with Indigenous governing bodies to further the purpose of the Fisheries Act;

It is concerning that it is still far from free, prior, and informed consent, a specific right that pertains to indigenous peoples and is recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

I am going to quote from the Nuu-chah-nulth's Ha'wiih, who are the hereditary chiefs of the 14 Nuu-chah-nulth first nations on the west coast of Vancouver Island. They have identified five concerns, and one is the purpose of the Fisheries Act, which must include reconciliation with aboriginal people. They said there is no reference to aboriginal people or unique and important ties to the fishery.

The Prime Minister has said that the "failure of successive Canadian governments to respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples in Canada is our great shame. And for many Indigenous Peoples, this lack of respect for their rights persists to this day."

Second, there is another quote from the Prime Minister: "We now have before us an opportunity to deliver true, meaningful and lasting reconciliation between Canada and first nations, the Métis Nation, and Inuit peoples.

Lastly, he has stated before that, "We are all in this together, and the relationships we build need to reflect this reality. In Canada, this means new relationships between the government of Canada and Indigenous Peoples – relationships based on the recognition of rights, respect, co-operation and partnership."

They would like to see this mean true, meaningful, and lasting reconciliation that includes reconciliation with aboriginal people in the purpose section of this legislation, and say, "We do not submit that Reconciliation is achieved by the Fisheries Act alone; rather, we submit that the Fisheries Act can assist in achieving Reconciliation."

They would like to see incorporating respect for indigenous law. They say, "We respectfully advise that section 2.5 should be amended by adding the following: the traditional and contemporary laws of the Indigenous peoples of Canada, as provided to the Minister."

Third, they are concerned about controlling ministerial discretion. They say "that the minister 'may' consider certain named issues when making a decision." They recommend that the word "may" in section 2.5 be changed to the word "shall". They say that, "We remain to be convinced that the government of Canada will always be a government that shares the need to preserve the environment, conserve and manage fish species conservatively, and respect the rights, laws, and traditions of Indigenous people."

Fourth, they would like to see consistency of the reference to aboriginal peoples.

Fifth, with regard to restoring fish habitat, they say, "While we approve of the protections being given to the Fisheries habitat, we cannot concede that enough is being done to restore the habitat and repair the damage done by industry, over-fishing, or mismanagement. We therefore recommend that the purpose of the Act be amended further by adding the following: 2.1(c) the restoration of damage for compromised fisheries and fish habitat".

They would like to see that in there. They say the time is now for the federal government to take the lead in habitat restoration. This legislation provides the perfect vehicle to do so.

Last, the bill gives a great deal of discretion around decision-making to the minister, allowing decisions to be made based on the minister's opinion rather than on scientific evidence.

In closing, we support the bill. We support restoring fish habitat. We would like to see some of these concerns addressed. These are concerns that are shared widely in my riding of Courtenay—Alberni, that are shared by many of the groups that are doing the hard work, many of the groups that are advocating for our salmon in particular, and our fish.

● (2225)

Many of the salmon enhancement groups have identified that they have not seen an increase in 28 years in many of the hatcheries.

This has been a failure of repeated governments. Hopefully the government will put forward a real plan so we can bring back our fish stock to abundancy.

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must say it is wonderful at long last to finally hear from a member on the opposition benches in a riding that actually touches the ocean.

As the MP for Halifax, which includes the great fishing community of Sambro, people in Atlantic Canada remember the reckless changes that the Harper Conservatives made to the Fisheries Act during their time in office. We remember the 430-page Conservative omnibus bill, which in 2012 gutted the protection of Canada's fish and fish habitat without consulting indigenous peoples, fishers, scientists, conservation advocates, or coastal communities in any meaningful way whatsoever. Bill C-68 would once again restore those protections that the Conservatives threw aside.

I am glad to hear organizations such as the World Wildlife Fund of Canada, Ecojustice, the David Suzuki Foundation, the Ecology Action Centre speak out in favour of the measures contained in this legislation.

Would the hon. member not agree that Canada needs a strong regulatory authority to protect our fish and fish habitat, as contained in Bill C-68?

Mr. Gord Johns: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly why we support this legislation for the restoration of habitat and protection for our fish.

I have also cited some concerns. The member talked about indigenous people. The legislation says "may consider" instead of saying "will consider". We are asking the government to amend that.

There are concerns around the Cohen commission report. It clearly stated that they have asked the government to separate salmon farming and aquaculture from DFO so that it can do its job, which is protecting our wild fish habitat and that salmon farming be a separate industry.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government continually talks about how the nation-to-nation relationship is the most important one, but then what it does is disastrous. We have heard my colleagues talk about how the murdered and missing aboriginal women inquiry and the pipeline were inadequate.

I would like to hear more detail from my friend in the NDP about the consultation that has happened on this legislation and how he feels it has helped indigenous people.

● (2230)

Mr. Gord Johns: Mr. Speaker, we do not agree with the Conservatives around this legislation. We are trying to restore and implement things they cut when they were in government that did not protect our salmon.

The member has raised a valid concern about consultation with indigenous people. The letter I have from the Ha'wiih, the hereditary chiefs of the Nuu-chah-nulth people, is because they have not been adequately consulted around the bill. They have brought forward their concern that they "may" be consulted instead of "shall" be consulted. That is a huge concern. It flies in the face of Bill S-262 that was recently passed, which was put forward by my colleague around applying UNDRIP. I am calling on the government to change the wording of that.

The government is currently fighting the Nuu-chah-nulth people in court. The government has repeatedly fought the nation in court, and the judge has ordered the government to get to the table and negotiate responsibly. It has not done that. It is carrying on the same policies from the Harper government in the past. The Liberal government has failed to sit down and have meaningful dialogue with the nation and negotiate fairly. It was in the recent judgment with the Nuu-chah-nulth, Ahousaht et al v. Canada, that the government had done everything it could to stymie negotiations.

If the government is going to honour and respect indigenous peoples, it should get to the table and negotiate with the Nuu-chah-nulth, who have won repeatedly in the Supreme Court of British Columbia. Canada needs to stop fighting indigenous people in court and show respect.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the hall in the Liberal Party just asked a question about why people from the Prairies were standing up to speak to this act. I guess he did not realize oceans and fisheries is on the Prairies and has an impact on a lot of our municipalities in how they go about conducting their business on a day-to-day basis. The Conservative Party of Canada supports protecting our lakes and rivers and the oceans and the fisheries. There is no question about that. Let us get that on the record right now: We support that and we are behind it 100%.

I love to fish. We have many colleagues who are in our hunting and angling caucus who love to fish. We do a lot of catch-and-release, we use barbless hooks, we take responsibility, and we take the appropriate measures when we are fishing to make sure that a fish, when it is caught, is returned alive and safe and there for somebody else to enjoy in the future. Northern Saskatchewan is a beautiful province to fish in. I know the member for Regina—Wascana has been here all night, and he would agree with me. When we go up into northern Saskatchewan, we see the development and the fisheries there and we see the people and the beautiful landscape and it is a great place to go fishing. I encourage all members to come to northern Saskatchewan and do some fishing with barbless hooks and catch-and-release because that is very important.

Back to the business of today, what the Liberals have done in Bill C-68 is add an additional layer of bureaucracy, and that is very concerning. In 2010 and 2011, we had SARM, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, coming into our offices, saying, "We need help. We are trying to build a culvert in a dry creek bed, and we cannot get approval from oceans and fisheries". I remember Bud Strube from the RM of Shellbrook came into my office and said, "We have a bed here that we have to change the culvert in because the beavers have dammed it." Because they dammed it up it didn't flow last spring, it took out the road, and did harm to the actual stream that the fish would go up and down during the spring season. Therefore, during spring runoff there is water in that culvert. By the time the middle of June hits, there is nothing in that culvert. They change it in July and August when there is nothing in the culvert and then it is there, ready for the next spring. However, they would apply to oceans and fisheries for the appropriate permits and it would sit on somebody's desk. It would be sitting there and it would be July, it would be August, September. November was coming so they were phoning to say they needed to get this done, freeze-up was happening. There would be no response. Finally when they got a response, it was already frozen up. They would go and change the culvert because they had to do it. They had to make sure the culvert was in place for the next spring's runoff. They would spend twice as much money. They are inefficient in how they do it. They cannot do as clean and nice a job in November as they could in July or August, but that is the result of having that type of bureaucracy on the Prairies.

The reality is we can have proper management of the waterways without the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy in this case is an example of where it has gotten in the way. When the government adds a bureaucracy, the first thing it does is try to justify why it should exist. What do the officials do? They start bringing in all sorts of crazy rules and regulations that they interpret on their own to make it tougher to do things. I will go back to my rural municipality example. I had a rural municipality just outside of Arborfield. It had some flooding and the people had to change some culverts. It was no problem, as it was pretty straightforward. Therefore, they thought they should do some mitigation the next year. Again, they were going to go in and put some different culverts in. The rules said they had to put in all these different types of mechanisms in case there should be rain. They spent two to three days putting in these mechanisms in case it should rain, to manage erosion and all that, where it would have only taken them two hours to change the culvert. Who pays for that? I pay for that. The taxpayer pays for that. Every person in that municipality paid for that expense. Where was the common sense? It was not with the bureaucracy.

That is where I get really concerned when I listen to members on the opposite side say, "Farmers are going to be protected here. We know that. We have not seen the regulations. We do not know what the regulations are going to say, but do not worry, it will all be fine." We have heard that before and we are not going to buy it again. This has a lot of concerns.

One other concern I have is about the transparency of the minister and his role in the decision-making process. When we make a decision, we base it on science; everybody in this House would agree with that. In this scenario, and the Liberals have done this in other areas, they have based it on the minister's interpretation of what he wants to achieve. That is not bankability, that is not predictability, and that is not even logical in a lot of cases. If they have science saying that this is the way something should be done, then that is the way it should be done. I want them to give me a good reason why they would not do that. What scares me even more is the minister does not have to reveal the science. He does not even have to justify his decision to the taxpayer. He can just do it. How does that make sense?

● (2235)

It does not make sense. Why would they put themselves in this scenario? In fact, in this type of scenario with good governance, it would never pass the smell test. It does not work.

If the government is basically telling people who are going to take on a project here are the rules, check all the boxes, and do everything by the rules, but the minister can come in at the end of the day and say, "You did not smile nicely; you didn't wear a nice enough tie. I am not going to approve your project." That can actually happen, and that is wrong. That should never be the purview of any minister in a Canadian government. That creates a lot of concern.

The Liberals talk about establishing advisory panels. Again, there is no context around what this panel would do, who it would be made up of, what it would consist of, or what the end goal at the end of the day is for that panel. However, some more Liberal members can be appointed to a panel, they would get their per diems, and life would be great. There would be another panel that would make some recommendations, and like I said about bureaucracy, the Liberals love to make rules to give themselves something to do.

What do we think this panel is going to do? I think panels are important. I think consultation is very important. I think it is important that government actually talks to the people who are affected, but when separate panels are created that do not have a vested interest in the project, what is the end game? Why are they there? That is very concerning.

We will work closely with fishermen and farmers. We will do what it takes to make sure that we have a proper fisheries going into the future. We will make sure that our kids and grandkids actually have a place to go fishing, that they will have a sector to work in, and that it will be profitable and bankable. After all, Conservatives know that the environment and the economy go hand in hand. The Liberals should actually take their own advice in that regard. We have to have balance. We have to mitigate the balance. We have to understand that there will be sacrifices once in a while in order to achieve what is better for everybody involved.

That is just the reality. That is part of the decision-making process. I think I will close right there, and open it up for questions. However, I am very concerned with what we are seeing here. We are seeing a reversal of things, and it will not make things better for Canadians. It will make it worse. It will not make us more competitive as a country or a better country; it will make us weaker. It actually will not create a future for our families, our kids, and our grandkids and their kids. It will make it harder. Why would we do this? It just does not make sense, unless there is a Liberal goal at the end of the day.

Again, we stand with our fishermen. We stand with the people in the sector. We will always stand up for them to make sure there is common sense when it comes to doing things in the fisheries.

● (2240)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the member is standing up for people, working people. We, too, are doing that.

In my riding, we have heard, loud and clear, that people would like to see a strong Fisheries Act to protect our fish. We have seen a decline, like never before, of our salmon, for example. The protections right now are currently inadequate to protect our salmon, our fish.

I will give an example. The NEB just ordered Kinder Morgan to stop installing plastic anti-spawning salmon mats in eight B.C. rivers. That is ludicrous that they have been ordered to stop, and these mats are still place, destroying salmon habitat.

Does the member think the minister should intervene and order Kinder Morgan to stop damaging critical salmon habitat?

Mr. Randy Hoback: Mr. Speaker, yes. If someone is doing something that is actually harming the environment, and there is a way to mitigate around that, they should be stopping that. They should be obeying the act. There is no question about that.

That does not mean stopping the project. That does not mean take the whole project and throw it out. The issues should be dealt with as the issues come up. That is why there is a whole pile of recommendations in the approval of the doubling of Kinder Morgan. They were put in place for a reason. As long as the company does what was recommended, it should be allowed to build that pipeline. That is why those recommendations were made.

However, no. Political games are being played, and it gets stopped, even though the majority of people are in favour of it, even though it is going to bring jobs and economic benefit to everybody across Canada, even though it is going to help pay for our health care and other social programs, even though it is going to provide jobs, jobs for men, women, minorities.

That is the silliness of the left. It picks one part of a project, and then says, "That makes it evil. The whole thing should be stopped." Let us deal with that problem, mitigate it, get rid of the problem, solve the problem, but do not throw everything else out. That is what is unfortunate with the NDP suggestion.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, although we are debating Bill C-68, I cannot leave the comments the member for Prince Albert just made unchallenged. I participated as an intervenor in the review of Kinder Morgan before the National Energy Board. There were two pieces of evidence. One was from Kinder Morgan that completing the expansion would create 90 new permanent jobs, 40 in Alberta and 50 in British Columbia, and that during construction, it would create 2,500 jobs a year for two years.

The other evidence about jobs came from the largest union representing oil sands workers in Alberta, Unifor. Its evidence was that completing the Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion would threaten Canadian jobs and cause a loss of jobs, with a direct threat to the remaining refinery in Burnaby, and losing, through opportunity costs, the jobs that could be created by having the product refined in Canada. Unfortunately, the National Energy Board ruled that jobs were not inside its mandate. It did not want to hear anything about jobs, and refused to hear the evidence from Unifor.

In fact, there is not a single study anywhere, despite all the rhetoric and propaganda, that tells us Kinder Morgan would be a long-term job creator in Canada. Again, the evidence the NEB refused to hear from the largest union involved was that it was a threat to jobs.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Mr. Speaker, I hope the member was open minded when she attended those hearings, and actually listened to all sides. Kinder Morgan is just one part of the whole sector. We needed Kinder Morgan to deliver the oil we were developing and for which we had a market. The oil sands and other oil fields needed that pipeline to get the oil to market. If we cannot get it to market, then there is no reason to have those companies operating. If we are pulling a product out of the ground that has nowhere to go then we do not pull the product out of the ground. Those are the jobs that are lost, and those the jobs were not accounted for.

Therefore, when the member talks about direct jobs in building the pipeline, that is true. When she talks about maintaining the pipeline, that is also true. However, that is just one segment of the whole industry. If we do not have that pipeline, if we do not deliver that product to market, we lose the rest of it behind it, and that impact thousands of jobs right across Canada. It impacts the type of social benefits we can provide to all Canadians.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak to Bill C-68.

I will begin by thanking the member for Prince Albert for the important points he made to this debate. I find it disappointing that science is being ignored, and the member for Prince Albert reminded us of the importance of respecting science. Rhetoric and false statements being made in the House to make a point really discredits that party, that individual, when they make false statements.

Regarding Kinder Morgan, the member for Prince Albert reminded us that the decisions need to be based on science and not on protesting, making outrageous statements, and carrying out illegal activities. As members of Parliament in Canada, we have to look at what is good for the country. What do we need to do? The Liberal government decided that energy east was a no-go. It ignored the science and made a political decision that energy east was a no-go, that Ontario and Quebec, the eastern part of this country, will have to continue to import oil from the Middle East. It will have to be tanked up the east coast and brought into Canada from a foreign entity.

Canada could be self-sufficient if we had energy east. We could ship our oil out of Canada if we had the infrastructure. Right now what we are hearing from the science base is that we move our oil and gas. We leave it in the ground, which means we destroy the standard of living that Canadians enjoy, or we move it by tanker or train, but we are not going to move it the safest way, which is with pipelines. It is bizarre. It is unscientific. It makes no sense when I talk to Canadians. Again, the member Prince Albert reminded us of the importance of respecting science.

I want to give a little history lesson on how we ended up dealing with Bill C-68.

I will go back to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, CEPA. It is a piece of legislation that a lot of regulations for environmental protection was based on. It passed in 1999, the prime minister was Jean Chrétien, and it came into force in 2000. CEPA needed to be reviewed every five years, which is very common with legislation. It came into effect in 2000, and the five-year review would have been in 2005.

Who was the prime minister in 2005? That was Paul Martin. Jean Chrétien's government went from 1993 to December 2003, and in 2003, Paul Martin took over. There was an election in 2004. I was elected in 2004.

I have served my community for 14 years in local government on city council. However, we had trouble even cleaning and maintaining the ditching system so that we would not have flooding, as that was constantly restricted. We heard from not only the local government that I served on but from farmers, and right across the country. Things were not working. Therefore, I was quite excited when I was elected in 2004 and expressed a strong interest in making sure that on the problems we had in the country we could always do better. We can learn from what is not working. Local governments and farmers need to be able to maintain proper drainage systems; otherwise, they plug up. That was very important.

I was really excited in 2006 when there was another election and Paul Martin was no longer the prime minister. Stephen Harper became the prime minister in 2006. I was honoured to be asked to be the parliamentary secretary to the minister of the environment. One of the first things we did was realize that the legislative requirement to deal with CEPA should have been done no later than 2005. It was now 2006.

● (2245)

The past Conservative government kept its promises. It did what was required for good governance. It served Canadians extremely well. The Canadian Environmental Protection Act review was overdue. We began with that and we spent a couple of years of consultation, hearing from Canadians about what needed to be changed. We heard that over and over again. That consultation included experts, scientists, and indigenous peoples. We did not rush it. We got it right. From that we made a lot of changes.

In the discussion that we have heard here, not science-based but rhetoric, where we have the NDP saying that the changes that were made hurt salmon. That is not true. We have heard from the Liberals that the previous government gutted protections without consultation. That is not true. *Hansard* will support that there were years of consultation to get it right. That is not what we see from the Liberal government where they ram things through using time allocation: "We have heard enough. We have heard from the witnesses who we chose and we wanted to hear from, so now that we have heard what we wanted to hear, we want to move this through." That is not in the interests of Canada, and it not science-based.

The Liberals have said that they want to restore the lost habitat protection. However, that is not what happened. There were improvements so that the drainage systems across the country could be maintained. People were not being fined. We were being realistic. Yes, we do need to protect our waters. We need to do that.

Those are the changes that were made by the previous government. Now what we have in Bill C-68 is again the rhetoric or statements that are not based on science. The end result will be layers of regulatory uncertainty.

There were over 50 witnesses that came to the committee. Not one of the witnesses could identify any harm that had been done by the previous government. Actually, the committee heard about the good that had happened. There was not one witness who could show by science any support for Bill C-68 and the need for any of the amendments and changes in Bill C-68.

There were over 50 witnesses. One of the witnesses came from the Canadian Electricity Association. With the changes of CEPA, which I spoke of a moment ago, we heard from electricity producers. They said that one of their challenges is that if they put fish into the streams and restock the streams, the habitats change. They want to improve the habitat to make it better and healthier. However, if they hurt any fish by having all of these new fish introduced into the streams and lakes, they will be held responsible for an existing structure. They said if we could provide freedom for them to make those changes, they wanted to do that. It is good for the environment, just like farmers wanting to make things better, so as long as they were not going to be hurt by doing that, they would like to be able to make those changes. That was one of the changes that was made.

Now what the Liberals are saying will restore lost habitats actually will have the opposite effect. That is what the Canadian Electricity Association said, that Bill C-68 represents one step forward but two steps back. Bill C-68 is a missed opportunity for the federal government to anchor the Fisheries Act in a reasonable population-based approach, rather than focused on individual fish, and to clearly identify fisheries management objectives.

What is being proposed creates uncertainty. It puts farmers at risk and it puts infrastructure at risk. What it does, though, is that it keeps a political promise made by the government. That is why we are not hearing science-based information. Rather, we are hearing rhetoric. It is really sad.

● (2250)

It was in 2005, just before there was a change in government, there was a report from the commissioner of the environment. It stated, "When it comes to protecting the environment, bold announcements are made and then often forgotten as soon as the confetti hits the ground". That is happening again, and that is not in the interests of Canada.

● (2255)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of concerns from people in our communities when the Fisheries Act was gutted in 2012. It was not just New Democrats. It was people across political lines, people who care about our fish. They were concerned that there were not adequate protections in place.

We saw a huge trend from forestry companies, moving their sorts to water. When those booms are sitting in the water a lot of that bark and sediment hits the bottom of our rivers and important estuaries and it has a huge impact on our salmon, especially our chinook. They need those estuaries and we need to make sure there is clean water for them, especially in their first year, on their way out, and especially for our sockeye coming in.

People have made it very clear that they want to see HADD brought back in. Perhaps he could speak to the significance of HADD. Does he support putting HADD back in place, because as a coastal person he knows how important fish are and how we work together with industry.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Mr. Speaker, in those nine years from 2006 to 2015, when we were in government, there was consultation. There were these changes, and there was a coast to coast tour on salmon. We started on the west coast and ended on the east coast. There is a problem with salmon. It has not developed over one year. It has been over many years. The previous Conservative Parliament was committed to trying to find those answers. Those answers are not only one issue. It is the whole issue of how we are protecting the environment and enhancing the environment.

Unfortunately, Bill C-68 will not solve that problem through rhetoric, because it is not science-based. I believe everyone on this side is committed to doing whatever is necessary to enhance the environment for the salmon, but it is a problem that may take many years of commitment from all sides to find the solutions.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, sitting on the fisheries committee, I had an opportunity to question many of the witnesses who came in as we looked at aspects of the changes that were made back in 2012 versus the gaps that people perceived. Notwithstanding my friend's comments about consultation, when I asked a panel of people from industry, particularly industry on the Prairies, in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, they certainly agreed they had been consulted. However, we consistently asked members of the indigenous community what kind of consultation they had been involved in, and they consistently told us that they had not been consulted. Not only that, during the course of our hearings we were constantly challenged by the Conservative members about accepting submissions from indigenous groups who had prepared material with financial assistance from the department for other purposes.

It was very clear that during our most recent deliberations they were not interested in hearing that input from indigenous communities, and it would not appear that they very actively sought it out when they did their process. I am wondering if my friend could comment on those reflections.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member. He is in a neighbouring riding, and I think we live in one of the most beautiful parts of the world.

It is interesting that we invite the witnesses and often the Liberals will invite people knowing what the answers are likely to be, but he said it was perceived that they had not been consulted. Then he connected the dots and said the previous Conservative government was not interested because there is this perceived lack of interest. In fact, science will show us, if he goes to *Hansard* he will see the long list of people who actually were called as witnesses, who were given the opportunity to testify over those many years before those changes were made.

There was, therefore, a massive amount of consultation. What we heard often was that sometimes within the process they found it frustrating when a provincial assessment would be done and finished and then there would be a federal environmental assessment. The same witnesses were called twice. They asked to just be called once because they did not like being called twice, and asked if people had not listened to them the first time. That was a common concern.

● (2300)

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to speak tonight to Bill C-68, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and other acts in consequence, and there are some consequences.

In the 2015 election campaign, the Liberals promised to strengthen the role of parliamentary committees. The Prime Minister promised Canadians that committees would be independent, giving them the ability to better scrutinize legislation and "provide reliable, non-partisan research" through their reporting to Parliament. Two years after the election, the same Liberals introduced Bill C-68, legislation that would bring in a number of changes to the Fisheries Act without considering a single expert's advice from stakeholders or the committee study of the bill.

The proposed changes ignore some of the major findings from a report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans that was presented to the House in February 2017. On September 19, 2016, the fisheries committee agreed to the following motion, which stated:

> ...review and study the scope of application of the Fisheries Act, and specifically the serious harm to fish prohibition; how the prohibition is implemented to protect fish and fish habitat; the capacity of Fisheries and Oceans Canada to deliver on fish and fish habitat protection through project review, monitoring, and enforcement; the definitions of serious harm to fish and commercial, recreational, and Aboriginal fisheries; the use of regulatory authorities under the Fisheries Act; and other related provisions of the act, and provide its recommendations in a report to the House....

The committee convened 10 meetings in Ottawa from October 31 to December 12, 2016, before presenting the report to the House of Commons in February 2017. Overall, the committee heard testimony from 50 different witnesses during the study and received over 188 submitted briefing notes. It was a comprehensive and fact-based study with experts from almost every province putting forward policy suggestions. If the government were truly committed to strengthening the role of parliamentary committees, this study should have formed the basis for Bill C-68 with all of that consultation.

The Liberals essentially ignored the committee's report, including one of its most important recommendations, which stated:

Any revision of the Fisheries Act should review and refine the previous definition of HADD [the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat] due to the previous definition's vulnerability to being applied in an inconsistent manner and the limiting effect it had on government agencies in their management of fisheries and habitats in the interest of fish productivity.

Following hours of testimony from the 50 witnesses and briefing notes from more than 180 associations, groups, and individuals, it was agreed that a return to HADD was not ideal, and that, should the government return to HADD, it would need to be refined and reviewed. Bill C-68 ignores this recommendation and introduces a return to HADD.

HADD is referred to in proposed subsection 35(1) of the legislation, which states, "No person shall carry on any work, undertaking or activity that results in the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat." Essentially, this means that any sort of development that could be harmful to, alter, disrupt, or destroy any fish habitat could be stopped or not approved by the government, taking us back to one of the major issues we have seen, especially with municipalities and the concerns they had when they tried to make any type of alterations. They would have to go to DFO and the provincial governments to make sure they were satisfying conditions that they knew, on the ground, were not necessary. It added costs.

I had the opportunity earlier to question the member for Cape Breton—Canso about the concerns municipalities had. He indicated that they are getting so much money that they really do not care whether or not that is the case. Of course, I think they would question just how quickly that money is coming out, but the concerns they have are still there. Going back to a system that does not respect the rights of communities and municipalities, and the concerns about agriculture and different groups that some members discussed earlier, it is no wonder we are having trouble getting different types of projects off the ground. This is a major concern, and hopefully I will have a chance to discuss that later.

● (2305)

As the committee report noted, this section was applied inconsistently and it was unclear. The concern is always that developers are often bogged down in these battles over the vague guidelines. For example, there was no clearly defined outline of what constituted a fish habitat, or what was seen to be harmful, in the previous version of the act. There was no clear path forward, and HADD became an obstacle to development, growth, and investment within the industry. It was becoming a consistent roadblock for projects and growth.

We need to listen to expert advice, instead of politically motivated advice. In the debate over the bill's provisions, stakeholders have been flagging this proposed change as problematic. The reinstatement of these measures will result in greater uncertainties for existing and new facilities, and undue delay. This can very well discourage investment at a time when Canadians and Canadian businesses need it the most. The key component here is certainly.

A few months ago, I had an opportunity to be with the trade committee in southeast Asia, and in some of the discussions we had with fund managers, we wondered how we could, in good conscience, tell people to come to Canada and invest. That is shameful when we think of the tens of billions in project dollars that have already left, and the fact that people are starting to say that Canada is not a place for an investment dollar. It is not as though an oil and gas project is not going to be developed. Otherwise, it will be developed, but it will be developed somewhere else in competition with us. For those who suggest that this is going to help with greenhouse gases and so on, this just changes it from an opportunity for us to use our natural resources, to some other place taking advantage of that.

Certainly, the same situation has occurred with the Kinder Morgan discussion, in which the government used $4.5 billion to purchase a 65-year-old pipeline, and gave that company the opportunity to go someplace else to build pipelines to bring someone else's product into eastern Canada. How is that ever going to change anything?

That is the major concern I have, and people see this as one of the major issues with government overreach, which is certainly the case here.

Let me be clear: Conservatives wholeheartedly support the protection of our oceans and fisheries. Our previous changes to the act brought a fine balance between encouraging growth in the industry and responsible conservation. Our previous changes to the act also enacted provisions that provided transparency in the decision-making process, and provided a level of certainty to those invested in the act. Unlike the Liberals, Conservatives listen to the people on the ground, instead of importing ideas and policies from Liberal insiders, foreign interest groups, and radical eco-activists. As Conservatives, we take our cues from Canadians, and we understand the importance of finding the right balance.

It was for this specific reason that in 2012, our former Conservative government removed HADD and replaced it with the following:

> 35 (1) No person shall carry on any work, undertaking or activity that results in serious harm to fish that are part of a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal fishery, or to fish that support such a fishery.

This definition was much clearer, and was more universally accepted because it struck the important balance required between development and conservation.

There are also changes within this bill that would undermine transparency and due process by allowing the ministers to withhold critical information from interested proponents. How is that transparent?

Another change I am worried about is the fact that the bill would allow the minister to establish an advisory panel with taxpayer-funded members and panellists, but does not set the guidelines or limitations for its use. Without any guidelines, these panels may be subject to abuse, especially if they are established by politically motivated individuals.

On behalf of the many Canadians and industry experts against the new changes, I join my Conservative colleagues in urging the Liberal government to listen to expert advice and reverse this senseless change, revisit the return of HADD, and amend the legislation to ensure that economic development and environmental protection go hand in hand and not head to head.

● (2310)

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, common sense should be a big part of public policy, and specifically so if we are going to be asking for farmers and municipalities to work with the federal government. As a city councillor, I remember in 2008 we came across a case in which we could not build a stairway to provide much needed and much wanted access to Campbell Mountain. This is because there was a water hazard that was identified by DFO as being fish habitat, and because of its proximity to the stairway, it said we could not build, even though we had money for developers to do so.

By the changes that are presented here, does he fear that farmers and municipalities are going to go back to making their case to DFO, which they do not feel listens to them? Do these changes provide practical ways for them to address problems in cases of flooding on farm fields or in cases in which municipalities want important access done properly?

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that can happen, especially being involved in agriculture. I remember a time when we got six inches of rain in about an hour. That changed a lot of waterways. Those are the sorts of things that happen. It is ongoing. These issues that occur are ongoing. Farmers have to be able to deal with them. They have to know whether they can go back in and rehabilitate that area. Sometimes it might takes years before that can happen.

These are the issues that are always there. The member had an example of a great project that had an opportunity to move forward, with all good intentions for the environment, and then they simply had someone with a badge come over and say, "No. You're not going to be allowed to do that. We're going to make sure that we shut that down."

That is the cause of uncertainty we see throughout Canada and is one of the reasons we are having so much difficulty convincing people that this is a place they can invest in. We have to look at this. We have to look for certainty. I think that is critical. That is a great example that was just presented.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, we have heard referenced a number of times in this place that municipalities across Canada were upset with the Fisheries Act, and that is why the Harper government acted to change it.

I just want to reference this again. I mentioned it earlier in debate. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities dealt with this issue in 2012. They brought before the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' annual general meeting a motion to urge former prime minister Harper to protect habitat and to take those sections out of Bill C-38 that weakened habitat protections. The motion was brought forward by a British Columbian, and former Conservative minister of fisheries, the hon. Tom Siddon, who happened to be an elected official within his own area of British Columbia. It was brought to the floor of the FCM, where it passed.

Where municipalities have weighed in on this issue, they have called for the protection of fish habitat. There is no question that there can be times when there are conflicts for some rural municipalities, but those issues have been largely dealt with in Bill C-68. It certainly has the support of municipalities across the country.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her comment, her discussion about the FCM, and some of the statements that were presented by individuals at the time.

Sometimes people get it wrong. I used to listen to David Suzuki as well, but I do not anymore. Sometimes we have to find out what the motivation is between individuals and the statements they are making. Certainly we have to make sure that we are protecting the environment, but we also have to make sure that we are able to expand our economy in such a way that we will be able to have resource money to do the kinds of things Canadians need to have done, such as build their hospitals, build their schools, and make sure that we have a safety net. That is the critical part.

We cannot just say that we should shut the country and let other countries do it. We know that they are going to, and we are going to be the Boy Scouts. That is not necessary.

● (2315)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak on Bill C-68 tonight. The comment that was made earlier this evening from one of my colleagues across the floor was that he was happy that a member from the west coast or a coastal riding was getting up and speaking about this. I am not picking on him for any reason, but I think it highlights one of the issues we are having with this bill. There seems to be a lack of knowledge or scope when it comes to our friends in the Liberal government not understanding the ramifications and implications that the decisions they are making with this bill will have on every region of the country. That is why we are seeing many of the rural members of Parliament from the Conservative side getting up to speak to this bill, because it will have very real and profound consequences on our rural communities.

I want to back things up prior to 2012, when these changes to the Navigable Waters Act and the Fisheries Act were made by the previous Conservative government. I recall I was a journalist at that time in a small community newspaper throughout southern Alberta. I remember covering numerous council and town hall meetings hosted by rural municipalities that were having significant issues when when it came to dealing with culverts, small bridges, drainage ditches, seasonal waterways, and irrigation canals, and the hoops, bureaucracy, and red tape they had to go through to try to complete some of those projects.

Prior to 2012, municipalities had to go through labour-intensive regulatory requirements when it came to areas of what was then called "navigable waters". They were forced to endure lengthy delays, because the Department of Fisheries and Oceans was inundated with thousands of applications from municipalities that were waiting for it to come and make decisions on their projects, not to mention the length of those delays. It proved extremely costly to these municipalities that were having to endure these very long wait times. I would think many of us who have rural municipalities in our ridings understand that many of these municipalities are extremely small. They simply do not have the financial or staffing resources to be able to handle the workload and amount of paperwork that comes along with a Department of Fisheries and Oceans assessment. Therefore, our rural municipalities were coming to the previous Conservative government with these problems and issues with respect to managing their own lands. That is when the previous Conservative government came up with these changes to try to reduce some of that regulatory burden. We wanted to turn the focus to ensuring that the protections in that legislation focused on the most critical fish and fish habitat in navigable waters. At the same time, we wanted to take some of that regulatory burden off some of the waterways that probably never had fish habitat and would never have fish habitat, but were still under the same regime and regulatory layers of bureaucracy that any river, stream, ocean, or lake would come under, when we were just talking about drainage ditches and irrigation canals, for example.

When we talk about some of the changes that were made, I think we need to highlight that the act maintained a very strong regulatory regime and protected very important fish habitat, but it had more of a practical scope. It reduced that administrative burden on not only municipalities, but also the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. It had now freed up a lot of its time and resources to focus on the most important cases and waterways without having to deal with very minor projects for municipalities. However, it also empowered municipalities to be the environmental stewards of their own waterways. When it comes to those types of projects and waterways, who would be better to be the stewards of those lands than the municipalities, the councils, and their staff, who are on the ground each and every day? They know the history. They have that local knowledge. They know whether it is fish habitat. They know if it is a seasonal waterway. Certainly, they know that better than a bureaucrat in Ottawa. Therefore, I think it was a win-win situation for the municipalities, as well as the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

● (2320)

Now we are faced with these changes in Bill C-68, which would expand the definition of fish habitat, expanding it even wider and more broad than it was prior to 2012. That is very disconcerting in the fact that it was burdensome and difficult to deal with and almost impossible to enforce prior to 2012. How difficult will this be when not only we restore it to the previous definition, but have even expanded that definition to a much wider scope. It has re-engaged a lot of those same regulations, but it also introduces something that is new, which is designated projects. This will include any projects within a category that could impact any waterway, whether it has a specific impact on a known fish habitat or not.

What is even more concerning for our stakeholders, municipalities, farmers, and ranchers is the fact that there is no definition on what a designated project is. This is really a larger narrative that we have seen from the Liberal government. It rushed through this legislation without doing all the homework and all the background work first so that it tabled a complete document that everyone could understand exactly where they stood. The legislation is very clear. The rules and regulations are very clear. There are still some very large holes in it with which stakeholders are very concerned.

The other issue, which is a large narrative with some of the Liberal legislation we have seen, is the minister would have more expanded and broader powers. This is very similar to what we have seen with Bill C-69.

We now have proponents in the energy sector that are divesting themselves of the energy sector because they do not feel there is a clear path to success. If they do apply for a project, whether it is pipeline, a mine, a forestry initiative, LNG, they could go through the regulatory process, through every environmental review, could pass all of those things, but at several steps during the process, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change would have the authority to step in and tell them to go back to the beginning. The minister could cut it off right there and tell them the project was not in the public interest or it was not something that could be supported. That would be the end of that project.

There is no clear definition of how to reach success or if there is a definitive pathway that people would know their projects would not succeed. We cannot have those types of projects at the whim of one person. That is very similar to what we see in Bill C-68 where the minister would have similar powers.

This is a crippling burden for municipalities that do not have the resources or the infrastructure to deal with these things. Imagine the burden and the impact it will have on farmers and ranchers who absolutely do not have the wherewithal to handle some of these issues.

Prior to 2012, a farmer in northern Alberta explained to me that he had a spring run-off area that went through his field. He would put a couple of 2x4s down during the spring so he could drive his machinery over it when he sprayed or seeded. However, Fisheries and Oceans came to him before 2012 and said that it was a waterway because it could float a canoe or a kayak. Certainly it could for about two weeks in the spring, but the rest of the time it was dry. He had to build a bridge over that seasonal spring runoff area. We are not talking about a river for the last pirate of Saskatchewan to float down the plain. This was simply a spring run-off. He was very concerned that he would have to go back to this. This will very burdensome to him.

Again, this goes back to the narrative that the Liberal government implements knee-jerk legislation, without doing the due diligence, without having an idea of what the ramifications will be and the unintended consequences, or doing the economic impact analysis of these decisions and what they will have on other sectors.

This is again another attack on rural Canadians. It is not science-based, front of package labelling, food guide, carbon tax. These changes will impact our rural communities, farmers, and ranchers who are struggling just to stay in business. Now there is a potential trade war with the United States.

For farmers and ranchers in rural municipalities, their livelihoods depend on healthy waterways, lakes, rivers, streams, aquifers. No one would take better care of these waterways than those who are on the ground, rural Canadians, farmers, and ranchers.

● (2325)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a great amount of respect for my colleague from Foothills. Certainly as well as being rural Canadians, we have a lot in common.

My concern goes back to when the Fisheries Act was gutted in 2012, and when the former government removed protections, especially HADD, we saw a huge number of forestry companies moving their log sorts to the water. When they do that, a lot of the sediment and bark ends up on the bottom of the river, especially in the Somass River, and it becomes a mat and that mat is a huge problem. Those pristine estuaries are very critical salmon habitat; they are important for chinook on their way out, they are important for sockeye on the way in. As we know, with climate change we are seeing warming of our waters. A lot of our sockeye coming back up cannot go too high because they cannot be in too warm water, and now they cannot go too low because there is not enough oxygen because it is being choked out by the matting that is being created there.

With the restoration of HADD, we are hearing huge concerns from people—this is not a partisan issue; this is is about our fish—about how loose things are when it comes to practices of moving our wood to our water. How can my colleague justify not having HADD when it is critical? Right now, unless a fish is being killed that is of commercial value and it is a commercial fish, no individuals are going to get charged when they behave like this and there are practices that are being implemented like this. What does the member propose? What is he going to do to help protect our fish in those important estuaries?

Mr. John Barlow: Mr. Speaker, I share my colleague's respect as well. I have always enjoyed his interventions.

He said early on in his question, "this is not a partisan issue; this is about our fish", but his first comment was "they" allegedly gutted the Fisheries Act. That is just not the case. We did not have a single witness who came to committee who could find any proof that the changes to the Fisheries Act and to the Navigable Waters Act in 2012 had any impact on the health of Canada's fisheries. The member knows that the changes that were made in good faith were there to protect our fisheries. They are being protected. There is no evidence of that to the contrary. What we are saying is we do not want to go back to the same burdensome red tape and regulations that were really impacting and have a detrimental impact on our rural Canadians as well as our farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a couple of times in this debate, we have had members of the opposite side say that at no time during our witness testimony did we hear any evidence of any damage as a result of the changes that were made back in 2012. It may not have come up during those deliberations, but we just heard, courtesy of our friend from Vancouver Island, the kinds of damages that could take place and many more may have been observed but not recorded because nobody was breaking the law and indeed thanks to cuts there were not necessarily the enforcement officers or others to even keep an eye on it.

However, the essence of this review of the Fisheries Act goes right to the point that our friend from the Prairies was making. We heard from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities about the hurdles that people had to jump through to get even a culvert rebuilt or a bridge repaired. I personally and many of my colleagues agreed that not dialling that back to the pre-2012 regulations would mark an improvement, would help to modernize the act. The other thing that came along, though, and it goes back to some earlier comments about the involvement of indigenous people, was more of a focus on indigenous knowledge and indigenous participation in helping to monitor the health of our waterways. I wonder if my friend across the way would consider both those developments as useful modernization of the act.

Mr. John Barlow: Mr. Speaker, I forgot to mention too for my friend from Vancouver Island that I really do appreciate his passion for his area.

To the question from my colleague, we are talking about the damage that could take place. No one saw any damage. There is a lot of innuendo and this is my problem with the Liberals' process in this bill. Everything is would have, should have, could have but it maybe actually did not happen at all. Nothing is science-based. If they want to make changes on this and legislation is going to have this kind of an impact on Canadians, then they should make sure they do their due diligence, make sure it is science-based, and make sure they do the consultation and that the changes they are making absolutely impact what they are trying to solve.

● (2330)

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will begin with a story. I will roll back to pre-2012.

My community of Abbotsford is the foremost farming community in the province of British Columbia. Somewhere in the order of 20% of all farm-gate revenues emanate from our community. Much of that is from two beautiful areas with A1-quality soil, Sumas Prairie and Matsqui Prairie, where there are all kinds of different farming operations under way.

I used to be a city councillor in Abbotsford. One of our farmers, who I will call Henry, was one of the pillars of our community. He was one of the originals in our community, one of the pioneers. He had farmed Sumas Prairie all his life. One day, he came into my office in a real fit of anger. He related to me that he had been on his land cleaning ditches that he himself had dug. A couple of years later, of course, those ditches were filling in with leaves, twigs, and other debris. He wanted to clear them so that his property could drain properly. Anyone who knows Sumas Prairie knows that it is an area that needs to be properly drained. It is a former lake bed, and it needs to be managed properly. However, Henry was in my office very upset, because as he was cleaning his ditch, a fisheries officer had approached him. By the way, he was a fisheries officer with a gun. He had accosted Henry and said, "Sir, don't you dare touch that ditch anymore. You're harming fish habitat."

Of course, Henry said that this was a ditch he dug for drainage purposes, and there were no fish in this ditch. "It is fish habitat we are protecting", said the fisheries officer, "and Mr. Farmer, you're not entitled to do anything with that ditch of yours."

We heard this from farmers across Abbotsford. My colleague, the member for Langley—Aldergrove, who served on city council with me, can verify those facts. Of course, city council had no power. This was federal legislation under which these officers were acting. That is why our former Conservative government, in 2012, stepped up to the plate and addressed this problem. We removed the focus on what at that time was fish habitat, and we replaced it with a focus on protecting fish, because that is what it is all about.

In light of the situation I just described, our government first of all looked at what is called the harmful alteration, disruption, or destruction of fish habitat, or HADD. We said that HADD was the wrong standard to apply. What we should be applying is any activity that results in serious harm to fish, not fish habitat, that are part of a commercial, recreational, or aboriginal fishery or to the fish that support such a fishery. That is the way the new legislation read, and it was warmly received.

My colleague for Saanich—Gulf Islands, the leader of the Green Party, suggested that Canadian municipalities did not support our 2012 amendments at all. That is patently false. What we should do is ask those of us who were in municipal government at that time, or in the years leading up to it, and we can tell members exactly why this legislation was introduced, and we had the strong support of municipalities across Canada.

● (2335)

Another one of the challenges of the legislation we have before us, which is a big step backwards, is the use of what is called the precautionary principle, which is basically better safe than sorry. The precautionary principle sounds great. We should always be safe rather than sorry. The problem is that it does not work in real life.

I refer the House to an article written in 2011 by Jonathan Adler, in which he talks about the better safe than sorry approach, the precautionary principle. He says, "We all accept this as a commonsense maxim. But can it also guide public policy? [Some people] think so, and argue that formalizing a more 'precautionary' approach to...health and environmental...will better safeguard human well-being and the world around us."

He goes on to say:

> If only it were that easy. Simply put, the precautionary principle is not a sound basis for public policy. At the broadest level of generality, the principle is unobjectionable, but it provides no meaningful guidance to pressing policy questions. In a public policy context, "better safe than sorry" is a fairly vacuous instruction.

Taken literally, the precautionary principle is either wholly arbitrary or incoherent. In its stronger formulation, the principle actually has the potential to do harm.

He goes on to say, "Efforts to impose the principle through regulatory policy", which is what our friends are doing here, but they are doing it in legislation, "inevitably accommodate competing concerns or become a Trojan Horse for other ideological crusades."

The problem with the precautionary principle is that it becomes a Trojan Horse for ideological crusades. Let me give the House a great example.

We have a government here that has been beholden to the environmental movement. In fact, the chief of staff to the Prime Minister, Gerald Butts, used to lead the World Wildlife Fund in Canada. Think about it. When we have a precautionary principle, it is people that have influence in government that are able to, unnecessarily through their influence, direct decisions in a way that suits their interests. If we have an ideological predilection in a certain direction, like Mr. Butts does, imagine how quickly we would find ourselves in a situation where it is speculation and ideology that replace true science as a basis for making decisions.

This legislation would establish remunerated advisory panels. When Liberals establish advisory panels, especially ones that are remunerated, they are used basically to allow insiders and friends to benefit from government.

Look at the surf clam issue in Newfoundland where the fisheries minister intervened. He provided special gifts to his friends by taking a surf clam licence away from one company that had pioneered the surf clam business in Newfoundland and giving it to another company that had connections to insiders in government and to friends and family.

What was the end result? This new company, which did not even exist and is still not incorporated, had no boat. Imagine that. It had no boat, but was awarded this licence, thereby depriving the people of Grand Banks, Newfoundland, of their opportunity to benefit, to have livelihoods, to have income from this business.

This is what happens when legislation like Bill C-68, which would amend the Fisheries Act, is twisted in a way that benefits the Liberal government, insiders, and friends of the government.

Canada as a country can do better.

● (2340)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the member's speech. As always, it was delivered with a lot of rigour.

The member said that the government's policy is not based on science. How was removing protections in the Fisheries Act in 2012 a decision based on science? Was it really based on ideology, the ideology that all environmental regulations impede business and should be removed because the economy and the environment do not go hand in hand? How is that not an ideological position?

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the member was actually listening to my speech, but that is not at all what I suggested.

The member has suggested that somehow the former Conservative government, in 2012, removed scientific protections. Nothing could be further from the truth. The changes that happened in 2012 were improvements to protection, which focused on what Canadians expect us to focus on, protecting fish. That is something the Liberals never could understand, and still do not understand. Today, they are taking a step backwards, again.

The changes in 2012 were all about applying science. The precautionary principle that the Liberal government is now introducing has nothing to do with science. It has to do with ideology and speculation. By its own definition, if we read the definition of the precautionary principle, it has to nothing to do with science. It is simply saying, "Better safe than sorry."

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when my colleague was in government, the government commissioned Justice Cohen to study the decline of sockeye salmon in the Fraser River. One of the recommendations, recommendation 3, was:

> The Government of Canada should remove from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' mandate the promotion of salmon farming as an industry and farmed salmon as a product.

DFO continues to promote salmon farming, the industry and the product, but it also has the mandate of protecting our fish.

Even the Pacific Salmon Foundation, which I am sure the member would agree has been a great steward and advocate for wild fish in British Columbia, put out a release on May 9:

> The Pacific Salmon Foundation (PSF) believes that British Columbia and Canada must put wild Pacific salmon first and that a move to closed-containment salmon aquaculture is recommended.

It is clear that the Liberals have left this absent in this new legislation. The Conservative government, before, did not implement the recommendation of Justice Cohen. Maybe the member could speak to whether or not he supports this recommendation by Justice Cohen.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I never expected to get that question in this debate, but it is a good one. We were just talking about it.

I can tell the member that I am very familiar with the work of the Pacific Salmon Foundation. In fact, I recently spoke to Brian Riddell, the executive director of the foundation. We talked about that very issue, the recommendation Justice Cohen had made. We were looking at that very carefully.

Pacific salmon are iconic to the west coast. It is very clear that the salmon are facing significant challenges. One of the recommendations, not only coming out of the Cohen commission report, but now coming out of the Pacific Salmon Foundation, is to have a very close look at salmon farming on the west coast, understanding that the most recent science on it seems to indicate that in fact fish farms are contributing to wild salmon mortality and declining salmon stocks.

I can assure the member that we are looking at this very closely. I would be quite prepared to enter into further dialogue with the member on this.

● (2345)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to debate this very important bill, Bill C-68, which deals with changes to the Fisheries Act. I will point out that in general, the government's legislative agenda is floundering. It has clammed up. Liberals are trolling the bottom. They are trying desperately to get through as much legislation as they can, and they are doing it under repeated time allocation. I looked hard, and there are no pearls in this one. The government is putting forward these changes to the Fisheries Act in defiance of good sense.

Now, this bill is very important in my riding. Why do I say that? I represent a riding in Alberta, and there are not a lot of people who earn their living by fishing in Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan. However, the framework that existed before 2012 with respect to fisheries protection and navigable waters protection is quite perverse. Members have spoken about this already. It is the idea that it was pretty easy to get almost anything designated as fish habitat. If my kids are out playing in the yard one day, they dig a hole, it rains, and it fills up with water, maybe that is a fish habitat. All of a sudden, that requires all kinds of processes, consultations, and changes. That obviously does not make any sense.

More seriously, there were issues with farmers, people who were building ditches for drainage, very simple normal activities. Things would fill up with water and all of a sudden get designated as fish habitat, which would invoke all kinds of different protections, regulations, and red tape from the federal government.

I do not think it is rocket science or even fish science to say that we should be thinking more rationally and strategically about how we protect our fish stocks. Rather than having this sort of proliferation of designation of fish habitat—and navigable waters was another issue that was drawing in similar kinds of over-regulation—we would try to be strategic about protecting fish stocks. We would think about what those critical points of protection were. We would have strong regulations in those cases, and, at the same time, we would not be protecting things in the wrong way.

On this side of the House, we favour rational, effective, and, as much as possible, surgical regulation; that is, regulation that does the thing it is intended to do, and the repeal of regulation that does not do what it is intended to do, that is not connected to a clear, rational objective. That is why, for instance, when Conservatives were in government, every time we introduced a new regulation, we developed a structure so that there would have to be a corresponding removal of regulation. Any time that ministers wanted to bring in new regulations, they also had to think about removing other regulations. That is a good approach, because sometimes government fails to think about repealing old, irrelevant regulations, trying to tighten up and smarten the rules. Again, it is not about not having those protections in place; it is about ensuring that those protections are rational and effective, and actually associated with the objectives that the regulation is in fact intended to serve.

In 2012, the previous government brought forward changes that shifted the focus from protecting fairly arbitrarily defined fish habitat to actually protecting and preserving our fish stocks. That was a good approach. It was widely supported by civil society. It was not supported by some voices, but, generally speaking, those who saw the practical problems and the practical need for improvement supported our approach. Some parties in this House waved the flag and said that fewer waterways were protected. We were effectively protecting vital waterways and assuring that the farmer's ditch, that hole that my kids dug in the backyard, did not get designated as a waterway. There was an appropriate level of protection for places where fish actually live, and there was no merit in applying those regulations beyond their usefulness.

● (2350)

Unfortunately, the Liberal government has sort of drunk their own bathwater when it comes to these talking points. They have bought into these lines about how they need to go back to the old regulatory system, which piled on unnecessary red tape and made it harder to do any kind of development, but with no discernible objective.

I did want to say if one wants to talk about what actually is harmful to fish and what is harmful to waterways, let us talk about the decision by the former Liberal mayor of Montreal to dump raw sewage into the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the approval he received from the environment minister to do that. Raw sewage and the environment do not go hand in hand. However, the government wants to make it more difficult to do science-based development. It wants to make life harder for the energy sector. It put all kinds of barriers in the way of energy development and pipeline development. It wants to make it harder for municipalities to develop by putting unnecessary regulatory burdens in front of them, unless one is a well-connected, former Liberal MP who is the mayor of Montreal. Then if one wants to dump raw sewage in there, go for it.

How did the fish feel when that happened? Do fish feel? I do not know, but it was not good for their health, is the point.

I know members across the way are excited about this point but they cannot get around it. Our approach was one that actually protected fish habitat, that actually sought to protect fish stocks. It was science-based, it was consistent, and it was safe and effective.

My constituents often ask me about the double standards they see from the government. On the one hand, it talks about the environment. On the other hand, the government's approach to environmental policy is totally disconnected from reality, such as the piling of hurdles on the energy east pipeline. Again, there was Denis Coderre's strong opposition to the energy east pipeline because there might be some spill, allegedly. That was his line associated with that. At the same time, the government was not thinking about the impact on the fish from raw sewage. This is a floundering legislative agenda, indeed. Someone has heard me repeat that joke. However, they are hearing it for the first time. That is good.

There are a few other provisions in this bill that I want to touch on, in the time that I have left. The bill raises transparency concerns and due process concerns. For one thing it allows the minister to withhold critical information from interested proponents. We have heard a lot of discussion from the government about transparency, about sunny ways, and about how sunlight is the best disinfectant. However, we actually see in reality a consistent refusal to apply this lofty talk on transparency in practice. We see that happening and that certainly is disappointing. Again, we see cases of that in this particular piece of legislation.

This bill, as I said, piles on additional unnecessary regulations. It fails the test of being surgical and focused on achieving any clear, discernible result. This bill allows also for the establishment of advisory panels. These have former Liberal politicians and soon to be former Liberal politicians salivating, I am sure, about the opportunities of joining advisory panels for which they will be, no doubt, richly remunerated. However, there is no clarity around the guidance they will be required to give or the limitations on the use of these panels, or the conditions that they will be subject to.

The government, in creating more opportunities for patronage appointments, is not thinking about the fish. It is only thinking about the well-connected Liberal insiders. At the time of clam scam, one would think that it would want to avoid even the appearance of this kind of problem. Alas, it has not.

● (2355)

There are many concerns that we have with the bill: the problems for development, the troubling mechanisms, and other points I have not had time to get to. In any event, I will be opposing the bill.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to give good news to my friend across the way. He can let his children go out and play in the yard, dig a little hole, and let water fall into it. He does not have to fear that the children are going to be in violation.

There has been a great deal of effort and consultation involving many different stakeholders. The department has done its job in presenting this legislation. In fact, there are more than just the government inside the House who support the legislation. On the other hand, there are the Conservatives, who have clearly demonstrated that the legislation does not matter. If they are against it, they will talk it, and talk it out. Their preference is to never allow it to see the light of day. That is one of the reasons why one ultimately has to bring in time allocation. We would never see the legislation passed if it were up to the Conservative Party.

My question to my colleague is, recognizing how Canadians want us to bring in progressive legislation such as this, why does the Conservative Party continue to be out of touch with what Canadians want to see when it comes to our waterways, our environment, and so on?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, it will not surprise my friend across the way that I quarrel with the premise of the question. Indeed, his late-stage conversion to the merits of time allocation is fishy indeed. He spent 20 years in opposition, provincially and federally, but now that he is in government, he finally has seen the light. He has it. Suddenly he knows that time allocation is a great and necessary tool for overcoming the obstructionism of the opposition.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Members are clapping, and soon after 2019, they will lose that insight I am sure. I am sure a few months after 2019, the member for Winnipeg North will realize that maybe it was not such a good idea after all. There will not be as much enthusiasm from the member for Winnipeg North from his post in the private sector.

I may have gilded the lily a little with the example of my children in the backyard. I acknowledge that, and did acknowledge that in my remarks. It is not a lily that requires much gilding, to be frank though. There are many examples that my colleagues have brought up. There are cases where ditches have been dug by farmers, and they been designated as a waterway and fish habitat all of a sudden.

The member also pointed out that the government is not the only party that supports the bill. Congratulations; you have the even further left parties in the House that support your radical agenda to make development as difficult as possible. If we are the only party standing for common sense in the next election, I am very proud of the opportunity that will give us.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to remind hon. members that when they come back tomorrow and they are talking, they will want to speak through the Chair. I am sure the hon. member did not mean my, whatever it was he was talking about.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise just a little after midnight to return to an important issue I have had occasion to raise in the House and at committee. It has to do with the provisions of the trans-Pacific partnership deal, particularly chapter 12, and the potential effects of that chapter for Canadian tradespeople.

Chapter 12 of the TPP is about entry into Canada for temporary foreign workers. Unfortunately, it recreates some of the worst abuses of the temporary foreign worker program that we saw under previous Liberal and Conservative governments. The Liberals have said they want to the program. However, on the one hand, they say they are trying to fix, On the one hand, through the trans-Pacific partnership, they are actually reinstating it.

Often when I have raised this issue, I have been drowned in platitudes by the government. I thought it might be useful to refer to the text to try and orient the debate on the real concern. It is a concern we have heard loud and clear from building trade unions, which have a lot of experience in interpreting these kinds of documents, whether they are collective agreements or other policies that have a direct impact on workers.

The provisions we are particularly concerned about have to do with the number of categories under which we believe workers can enter Canada to perform trades work and if they meet the spirit of the agreement or not. We have certainly seen instances before where companies bring in workers in defiance of the spirit of agreements for temporary workers.

However, the TPP is very clear. For these categories of workers it states, "Canada shall grant temporary entry and provide a work permit or work authorisation to", in this case professionals and technicians, "and will not:

> (a) require labour certification tests or other procedures of similar intent as a condition for temporary entry; or
>
> (b) impose or maintain any numerical restriction relating to temporary entry.

Members of the building trades have been very clear, to us on this side of the House, and they have made similar arguments to members of government, that this essentially means that there will not be any ability to have any kind of meaningful skills testing or to ensure that the workers who are brought in meet Canadian standards. There is also not going to be any attempt to canvas the Canadian labour market to ensure there are not qualified Canadians looking for that work.

I am coming back to that issue. If we look at agreements like the trans-Pacific partnership, and we have seen it in other trade agreements, when big business wants something in the agreement, it gets it, and it gets it in the legal wording of the text. Those are the types of assurances it gets and it knows it can go to court, whether to a real court, a national court, or an international trade tribunal established under the auspices of whatever agreement it is, and get satisfaction if those rules are broken.

However, when it comes to workers, there is no guarantee for workers in these agreements. When it comes to workers, it is always, "Trust us. We're going to set up a little program" or "We'll have some regulations." However, that will depend completely on the government of the day. There are no real assurances that the government will have any meaningful enforcement mechanism when it comes to this. There is no reassurance that it will be able to track these workers once they are in the country and ensure they perform work in accordance with this deal.

Therefore, why is the government willing to put assurances in these deals for big corporations and not for workers?

● (2400)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Elmwood—Transcona for raising the CPTPP tonight. There has never been a better time to diversify our trade. Our government has been hard at work opening new markets for our Canadian exporters.

Last year we ratified and implement CETA, an ambitious new trade agreement with the European Union, opening up access for Canadian businesses and workers to sell their products and services to a market of over 500 million people with government procurement alone of over $3.3 trillion.

The CPTPP continues this ambitious effort to expand and diversify our trade. This agreement will benefit Canadians and the Canadian economy for years and decades to come. It opens up access to a Pacific trading bloc of 500 million people, with a combined GDP of $13.5 trillion.

Canada's commitment in this agreement helps to support investment and growth in Canada and supports the businesses and livelihoods of Canadians doing work here and abroad. Our government has been consulting with Canadians, including with tradespeople and skilled workers to ensure that the CPTPP provides Canadian businesses with improved access to CPTPP markets while at the same time not compromising our domestic labour market.

The agreement's chapter on temporary entry facilitates labour mobility and provides reciprocal access, for example, to certain highly skilled professionals and technicians, including certain skilled trades into certain CPTPP markets.

As the member will also know, there are key safeguards written into the text of chapter 12. Our government is committed to protecting the integrity of our domestic labour market. We continue to work with our building trades, among others, to ensure that our implementation of this agreement respects that commitment.

For the category of professionals and technicians that the member raised, the agreement includes a wage requirement. There is an education requirement. There is an experience requirement. All domestic requirements, including licensing and certification, continue to apply. It is all written there in the text.

This government's goal is to set a higher bar for openness and transparency. We have delivered on this promise.

On February 20, we made public the final text of the CPTPP. We have also published the government's economic modelling on the estimated economic and commercial benefits of the CPTPP for Canada. Canada's economy stands to gain $4.2 billion by 2040 as a result. As the member is also aware, the hon. Minister of International Trade tabled the CPTPP treaty with all binding side instruments in the House of Commons on May 22.

With the CPTPP, Canadian businesses and Canadians are getting the opportunity to explore new markets and create new jobs. We are working hard to ratify this important agreement. As the Prime Minister indicated last week, the government will introduce implementing legislation this spring with the goal of ratifying the CPTPP expeditiously.

● (2405)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I can tell from the member's answer that she has never been on the books waiting for a call for a job while knowing full well that a company imported a temporary foreign workforce in order to build a construction project in her city. If she believes there is a bunch of Canadian trades workers waiting at home for the next opportunity to build a condo tower in Brunei, she is pretty seriously mistaken.

Canadian tradespeople want to be able to get work close to home and chapter 12, for as much as she wants to extol the virtues of the TPP generally, does not have protections for workers and there are no mechanisms for the federal government to track these workers once they are in Canada. The agreement specifically prohibits them from doing any kind of real skills testing and even the wage requirements do not mean a lot if the government is not tracking that and does not have a system to ensure that the workers are being paid what they were promised.

We know that this was a notorious problem with the temporary foreign worker program. I wonder if she would like to revise her answer in light of those facts.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of International Trade told the hon. member in March, our government is engaging with Canadian labour unions and we will continue to do so because we want, and Canadians deserve, a strong agreement that works for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

I thank the member for Elmwood—Transcona for his advocacy on behalf of Canadian tradespeople, and I hope our government can count on the support of the NDP when it comes time to ratify and implement this agreement.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am rising tonight at adjournment proceedings, and the hour is late. The hour is late both literally and metaphorically, because I am addressing the topic of climate change, and we are literally running out of time.

I raised this question in question period on March 2. I addressed the fact that it was startling, and actually terrifying, that the Arctic was going through a thaw at that time through the month of February, that the Arctic defence as being the polar vortex appeared to have collapsed. I referred to it as being like an advancing army. Warm air from the south had occupied our Arctic, driving up temperatures 25 degrees Celsius above what is normal at that time. Of course, throughout the winter months, no sun reaches the Arctic. It is 24-hour darkness, so what was occurring that we should have a thaw in our Arctic at that time was actually a signal that what we are doing to our climate is beyond what we are experiencing in the south, where we see extreme weather events. We are actually tampering with the ability of this planet to support life.

After that question was put in question period, we had more disturbing warnings that the Gulf Stream has slowed to its lowest point since measurements began. The Gulf Stream is slowing because as the Arctic ice melts, it goes in through the currents and reaches the Atlantic Ocean areas, where the Gulf Stream is moving, but it depresses the Gulf Stream, because it is fresh water, and it floats on top and presses down on the Gulf Stream and weakens it.

We have also had worrying evidence that the Greenland ice sheet and the western Antarctic ice sheet are weakening, and both of them are on land. If either of those dislodged into the ocean, unlike the melt from the ice that floats on water I just mentioned, this would cause an acute sea-level rise. Either one of those events would result in an eight-metre sea-level rise.

What I submitted to the hon. Minister of Environment and Climate Change—I put the question to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Environment responded—is that we are in a climate emergency, but we are acting as though it is a political promise that can be handled incrementally. It is not the current Prime Minister's fault that he took office at the point that procrastination is no longer viable. Incremental change will not ensure that our children have a livable world.

There has been a lot of work done. By the way, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change said on that day, March 2, "We are all in on climate action." I submit that although the intentions are better from the current government, there is no sign that the Liberals are all in. If we were serious, we would recognize that the current target left over from the Harper administration does not meet our Paris target. It is not even close. As things now stand, we are not on track to meet the weaker Harper target.

If we were all in on climate change, it would look like this. We would look at the carbon budget, realize there is only so much more CO_2 we can put in the atmosphere, and work globally to get every country on earth to increase ambition and put in place a tougher target.

For Canada, we would do more than carbon pricing. That is just a first step. We would eliminate subsidies to fossil fuels. We certainly would not buy a pipeline. We would divest our investments in fossil fuels in the Canada pension plan. We would eliminate all subsidies. We would use all the levers we have, including that the Minister of Environment and Climate Change has the power to regulate through part 4 of CEPA. We would do absolutely everything at our disposal, including eco-energy retrofits, to ensure that we meet the Paris target of 1.5 degrees Celsius.

● (2410)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her strong advocacy when it comes to climate change and taking action.

The Government of Canada is taking concrete action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, support clean growth, and build a climate-resilient infrastructure. In addition to being one of the first countries to sign and ratify the Paris Agreement, Canada is also following through on its Paris commitments by implementing a national plan to reduce its GHG emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030 and build resilience to the impacts of climate change.

A landmark achievement is the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. It is the first climate change plan in Canada's history to include collective and individual commitments by federal, provincial, and territorial governments, and to have been developed through engagement with national representatives of first nations, Inuit and Métis nations, the general public, non-governmental organizations, and businesses. The pan-Canadian framework includes more than 50 concrete measures to reduce carbon pollution, build resilience to the impacts of climate change, foster clean technology solutions, and create good jobs that contribute to a strong economy. This includes putting a price on carbon.

To support implementation of the pan-Canadian framework, the Government of Canada has announced historic investments, including the low-carbon economy fund and the investing in Canada plan, which supports projects aimed at reducing GHG emissions and generating clean growth. By investing billions of dollars in green infrastructure and public transit, including smart grids, energy-efficient buildings, and electric vehicle infrastructure, the federal government aims to help mainstream innovative, clean technologies. Furthermore, to bolster climate resiliency, the government's $2-billion disaster mitigation and adaptation fund backs large-scale national, provincial, and municipal infrastructure projects to reduce the impacts of natural disasters and extreme weather events and build resilient communities across the country.

Government leadership is critical to achieving Canada's goal for environmental and sustainable development. Introduced in 2017, the greening government strategy sets an ambitious target to reduce GHG emissions from federal operations by 80% by 2050, relative to 2005 levels. When the policies and programs within the pan-Canadian framework are fully implemented, the framework will not only allow Canada to meet its 2030 target in full, but also position Canada to set and achieve deeper reductions by 2030.

We continue to work with our partners, including provinces, territories, and indigenous people. We have been listening to Canadians from across the country. We are committed to annually reporting on Canada's greenhouse gas emission projections and issuing annual pan-Canadian framework reports to take stock of progress achieved and give direction to sustain and enhance our efforts.

We have made taking action on climate change a priority. Tackling climate change and helping our country transition to a low-carbon economy are the smart thing to do and the right thing to do. Taking action on climate change is not just the priority of the Government of Canada; it is an imperative for all of Canada. Our significant achievements since 2015 demonstrate that we are serious not only about developing a real plan to reduce our emissions, but about turning that plan into action and results.

As for the Arctic, we are working with all departments, provinces, territories, indigenous peoples, and northerners to co-develop an Arctic policy framework that recognizes and re-prioritizes federal activities in the Arctic. This framework is intended to increase partnerships and collaboration with federal government, indigenous peoples—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, here is the problem: There is no climate plan from the government; there is a climate wish list. There is a pan-Canadian framework, but it is a compilation of what provinces and territories plan to do without federal leadership. Other than the carbon pricing scheme and the promise, not yet delivered, to eliminate subsidies, the federal government is not using the levers it has at its disposal.

The target that my hon. colleague mentioned is the one left over from Harper. I repeat: It will be too little, too late. The year 2030 is too far out there for us to guarantee our children a liveable world.

I recommend that the government look at the 2017 report called "Three Years to Safeguard Our Climate". It was signed by over 100 climate experts, led by Christiana Figueres. It is very clear. We cannot let it go past 2020 before we turn the corner, before we bring greenhouse gas emissions down. We have to do it quickly, or the chance to hit 1.5° Celsius and hold it there will be forgone and foreclosed, and our children will have an unlivable world.

● (2415)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, the pan-Canadian framework commits to ongoing monitoring and reporting of results to ensure that policies are effective, to take stock of progress achieved, and to inform Canadians of the future national actions in accordance with the Paris Agreement.

This includes annual reporting to the Prime Minister of Canada, and to provincial and territorial premiers, external assessments and advice by experts, meaningful engagement with indigenous peoples, and a review of carbon pricing approaches in 2020 and 2022.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the opportunity last week to raise an important question about Iran's role fomenting violence on Israel's border, and the government's failure to point the finger in the right direction in light of the terrible loss of life that occurred at that border.

In my question, I referenced statements by the Palestinian ambassador to France, who acknowledged that "Iran is fully financing and pushing the Hamas demonstrations".

While the West Bank is controlled by the Palestinian Authority, an organization certainly with problems, but which has expressed its commitment to peace and to a two-state solution, the Gaza strip is totally controlled by a violent terrorist group, Hamas, whose sole aim is the violent defeat and destruction of Israel.

Canada must work with the Palestinian people to support and build the capacity of a legitimate representative government, but this requires the isolation and defeat of Hamas. Although Israel is their target, the Palestinian people are Hamas's first victims. Hamas is shameless in its efforts to increase and use the suffering of the Palestinian people for its own cynical political ends.

How else do we explain its actions? In the midst of a humanitarian crisis, Hamas has repeatedly refused to allow Israel to send aid into the Gaza Strip. It blames the occupation, but there is no occupation in Gaza. It blames the blockade, while it refuses aid, and it repurposes aid and other forms of support as tools to attack Israel. Its charter is explicit that it will countenance no peace accords, that its goal is to attack, to annihilate Israel, and to continue to do so without any compromise whatsoever.

If we look at the record of Hamas, it has always focused its resources and its efforts into attacking Israel. It has invested in rockets, when it could have been investing in schools, opportunity, and support for Palestinian young people. It built terror tunnels to try to attack Israel, when it could have been building infrastructure, again that the Palestinian people need.

Japan sent kites for Palestinian children to use, to have some joy in flying kites. Instead, those kites were repurposed as another tool with which to attack Israel, trying to set fire to nearby towns. The so-called "Great Return March", organized by Hamas is typical of Hamas tactics. It mixes civilians and militants together in a violent march on Israel's border, aiming to use the Palestinian people as human shields, and thus to be able to infiltrate Israel with militants who could then carry out violent attacks.

This is tragic for the Palestinian people, but the perpetrator must be clearly identified as the Hamas terrorist group. We took issue in the opposition with the fact that the Prime Minister issued a statement about violent clashes at the border that made no mention of Hamas. I would ask, what does it mean to be a friend and ally to Israel? The government professes its friendship with Israel. The government is not much of a friend if, in the midst of a violent attack on the border, Canada fails to name the attacker and instead crafts a statement which singles out Israel for responsibility.

I would ask, how would Canada respond in a similar situation? How could Canada respond if there were a violent march on our border aimed at infiltrating our territory and attacking Canadian civilians? How would Canada respond? That is my question for the parliamentary secretary. Why this one-sided statement singling out of Israel, and not mentioning—

● (2420)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government deplores the actions of Hamas and its incitement to violence. It has been listed as a terrorist organization in this country since 2002, with very good reason. Hamas is a violent terrorist organization that uses hateful rhetoric to incite violence against Israel and the Israeli people. While Gazans struggle to feed their families, like the member said, Hamas builds tunnels and launches rockets at Israel, rather than providing for the lives of its desperate Gazans.

Hamas has been a leading cause of the miserable situation in the Gaza Strip, which has driven so much frustration and hopelessness among the Palestinians there. We condemn Hamas for continuing to focus on attacking Israel rather than providing and improving the lives of desperate Gazans. We also condemn Iran's sponsorship of terrorism abroad, including its sponsorship of Hamas and its activities. That is why Canada has listed Iran as a state supporter of terrorism under the State Immunity Act.

Canada has also listed the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps under the Special Economic Measures Act. The IRGC's operations in the region, including its support of Hamas, are carried out by the IRGC Quds Force. That is why Canada lists this force as a terrorist entity under the Criminal Code and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps is listed under our SEMA sanctions.

Iran's support for terrorism and that of the Assad regime in Syria has exasperated the regional conflict. We strongly believe that the Iranian authorities must uphold and respect democratic and human rights and that the Iranian people have the right to free assembly and to express themselves without facing violence and imprisonment. Our government also believes that any provocative actions by Iran toward Israel are unacceptable.

The state of Israel is a close friend and ally. We share Israel's concerns about Iran's provocative behaviour in the region, including Iran's support for Hamas, its support of Hezbollah near the border in Lebanon, and its ongoing involvement in Syria. Canada's strong support of Israel is clear. Israel has a right to live in peace, with boundaries, and to ensure its own security in the face of Iranian aggression. Following the violence in the Gaza Strip that led to the tragic loss of life and injured many people, Canadians joined many allies in calling for an independent investigation to thoroughly examine the facts on the ground. Canada's call was for an investigation into excessive use of force, violence, and any incitement.

Our position on Hamas is clear. We condemn the terrorist organization for its aggression and we agree that the role it played in inciting violence and hate must be investigated.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, the government, some of the time, on certain points, talks a good game on this, but some of the words it uses are slippery. It is important to identify that slipperiness and challenge it, because in any other democratic country, what would happen in a case like this is that one would trust the independent mechanisms for self-assessment that exist in that country, and yet the Liberal government threw doubt on that by implying that there was a need for an independent external investigation, something that it did not call for, at least initially, in Iran. With the Seyed-Emami case, it said Iran should investigate itself.

I want to ask the member for her comments about an independent investigation. Does she think that Israeli independent internal mechanisms are adequate for conducting the investigation the government spoke about?

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we establish the facts on what has happened in Gaza. As the government has said, Canada stands ready to assist in such an endeavour. We will work closely with our international partners and through international institutions to address this serious situation. This includes the actions of all parties.

Let us not forget that a Canadian was among the wounded, along with so many unarmed people, including civilians, members of the media, first responders, and children. We should all be united in wanting to find out as much as possible about the details involving harm against a Canadian abroad.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until later this day at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:28 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, June 11, 2018

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Visitability
Motion ... 20601
Mr. Shields ... 20601
Ms. Sansoucy ... 20602
Mr. Serré ... 20603
Ms. Harder ... 20604
Mr. Hehr ... 20606
Mrs. Nassif ... 20607
Mr. Harvey ... 20608
Division deferred ... 20609

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply
Opposition Motion—Iran
Mr. Genuis ... 20609
Ms. Kwan ... 20613
Mrs. Kusie ... 20613
Ms. Kwan ... 20614
Mr. Alghabra ... 20614
Mr. Genuis ... 20617
Ms. Hardcastle ... 20617
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20617
Mr. Bagnell ... 20618
Ms. Hardcastle ... 20618
Mr. Genuis ... 20620
Mr. Angus ... 20620
Ms. Dabrusin ... 20620
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20621
Mr. O'Toole ... 20621
Mr. Alghabra ... 20623
Ms. Benson ... 20623
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20623

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Gasoline Prices
Mr. Plamondon ... 20624

Humber River—Black Creek
Ms. Sgro ... 20625

Father's Day
Mrs. Block ... 20625

Bill Davis
Mr. Cuzner ... 20625

Justice
Mr. Rankin ... 20625

Indigenous Affairs
Mr. Ouellette ... 20625

Father's Day
Mr. Warawa ... 20626

Canadian Men's Health Week
Mr. Sarai ... 20626

Ramadan
Mr. Anandasangaree ... 20626

National Blood Donor Week
Ms. Gladu ... 20626

Harold Thomas Herbert
Mr. Schiefke ... 20627

Canada-Ukraine Friendship Group
Mr. Wrzesnewskyj ... 20627

Security
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20627

Filipino Heritage
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20627

National Day of Healing and Reconciliation
Ms. Jolibois ... 20627

Apology for Residential Schools
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) ... 20628

Education for Women and Girls
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes ... 20628

ORAL QUESTIONS

International Trade
Ms. Bergen ... 20628
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20628
Ms. Bergen ... 20628
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20628
Ms. Bergen ... 20629
Mr. Champagne ... 20629
Mr. Rayes ... 20629
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20629
Mr. Rayes ... 20629
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20629
Ms. Brosseau ... 20629
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20629

Natural Resources
Ms. Brosseau ... 20629
Mr. Garneau ... 20630
Mr. Cullen ... 20630
Mr. Carr ... 20630
Mr. Cullen ... 20630
Mr. Carr ... 20630

Finance
Mr. Poilievre ... 20630
Mr. Morneau ... 20630
Mr. Poilievre ... 20630
Mr. Morneau ... 20630

Carbon Pricing
Mr. Poilievre ... 20631
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20631
Mr. Poilievre ... 20631
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20631
Mr. Deltell ... 20631
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20631

Finance
Mr. Deltell ... 20631
Mr. Morneau ... 20631

International Trade
Ms. Ramsey ... 20632
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20632
Ms. Ramsey ... 20632
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20632

Carbon Pricing
Ms. Gladu ... 20632
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20632
Mr. Schmale ... 20632
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20632
Mr. Sweet ... 20633
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20633
Mr. Brassard ... 20633
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20633

International Trade
Mr. MacGregor ... 20633
Mr. MacAulay ... 20633
Ms. Sansoucy ... 20633
Ms. Bibeau ... 20633

The Environment
Mr. Samson ... 20633
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20634

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20634
Mr. Garneau ... 20634
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20634
Mr. Hussen ... 20634

Foreign Affairs
Mr. O'Toole ... 20634
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20634
Mr. O'Toole ... 20634
Mr. DeCourcey ... 20634

The Environment
Mr. Choquette ... 20635
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20635
Mr. Johns ... 20635
Mr. Wilkinson ... 20635

Employment
Mr. Kent ... 20635
Ms. Hajdu ... 20635
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20635
Ms. Hajdu ... 20635
Mrs. Stubbs ... 20636
Ms. Hajdu ... 20636

Indigenous Affairs
Ms. Sahota ... 20636
Ms. Monsef ... 20636

Citizenship and Immigration
Ms. Rempel ... 20636
Mr. Hussen ... 20636

Foreign Affairs
Ms. Laverdière ... 20636
Mr. DeCourcey ... 20636

Employment
Mr. Easter ... 20636
Ms. Chagger ... 20637

Ethics
Mr. Doherty ... 20637
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20637

Marijuana
Mr. Barsalou-Duval ... 20637
Ms. Petitpas Taylor ... 20637

International Trade
Mr. Marcil ... 20637
Ms. Bibeau ... 20637

Indigenous Affairs
Mr. Tootoo ... 20637
Mrs. Philpott ... 20638

Presence in Gallery
The Speaker ... 20638

Canada-U.S. Trade
Ms. Ramsey ... 20638
Motion ... 20638
(Motion agreed to) ... 20638

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Impact Assessment Act
Bill C-69. Report stage ... 20638
Motions Nos. 1, 15 to 23, 28 to 61, 100 to 103, 105 to 147, 149 to 205, 208 to 214, and 216 negatived ... 20639
Motions Nos. 3 and 25 negatived ... 20641
Motions Nos. 4, 9, 10, 12, and 13 negatived ... 20642
Mr. Kang ... 20642
Motions Nos. 5, 8, and 148 negatived ... 20643
Motions Nos. 11, 26, and 27 negatived ... 20644
Motion Nos. 62 to 64, 66 to 79, 81 to 99, 104, 206, 207, and 215 negatived ... 20646
Ms. McKenna ... 20646
Motion for concurrence ... 20646
Motion agreed to ... 20647

National Security Act, 2017
Bill C-59. Report Stage ... 20647
Motions Nos. 1 and 2 negatived ... 20648
Mr. Goodale ... 20648
Motion for concurrence and second reading ... 20648
Motion agreed to ... 20649

Criminal Code
Bill C-75. Second reading ... 20650
Amendment to amendment negatived ... 20651
Amendment negatived ... 20652
Motion agreed to ... 20653

Export and Import Permits Act
Bill C-47. Third reading ... 20654
Amendment negatived ... 20655
Motion agreed to ... 20656

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20656

Interparliamentary Delegations
Mr. Bagnell ... 20656
Mr. Baylis ... 20656

Committees of the House
Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of People with Disabilities
Mr. May (Cambridge) ... 20656
Fisheries and Oceans
Mr. Hardie ... 20657
Mr. Doherty ... 20657
Mr. Hardie ... 20657

Petitions
Canada Summer Jobs Program
Mr. MacKenzie ... 20657
Indigenous Affairs
Mr. Cannings ... 20657
Filipino Heritage Month
Mr. Baylis ... 20657
Canada Summer Jobs Program
Mr. Shipley ... 20657
Killer Whales
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20657
Visas
Ms. Kwan ... 20658
The Environment
Mr. Paradis ... 20658
Canada Summer Jobs Program
Mr. Chong ... 20658
Accountability
Mr. Stetski ... 20658
Status of Women
Mr. Stetski ... 20658
The Economy
Ms. Mathyssen ... 20658
Canada Post
Ms. Mathyssen ... 20658
The Environment
Mr. Johns ... 20658
Falun Gong
Mr. Ouellette ... 20659
The Environment
Ms. Malcolmson ... 20659

Questions on the Order Paper
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20659

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20659

Point of Order
Standing Order 69.1—Bill C-59
Mr. Dubé ... 20662

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply
Opposition Motion—Iran
Motion ... 20663
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20663
Mr. Genuis ... 20663
Mr. Johns ... 20663
Mr. Levitt ... 20664
Mr. Genuis ... 20665
Mr. Angus ... 20665
Mr. Baylis ... 20665
Ms. Goldsmith-Jones ... 20666
Mrs. Wagantall ... 20667
Mr. Johns ... 20667
Mr. Genuis ... 20667
Mr. Lloyd ... 20667
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes ... 20669
Ms. Kwan ... 20669
Mr. Genuis ... 20669
Mrs. Kusie ... 20670
Mr. Johns ... 20671
Mr. Sweet ... 20671
Mr. Housefather ... 20671
Mr. Johns ... 20673
Mr. Genuis ... 20673
Mr. Levitt ... 20673
Mr. Mendicino ... 20673
Mr. Falk (Provencher) ... 20675
Mr. Johns ... 20675
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20675
Mr. Bezan ... 20676
Division on motion deferred ... 20677

Points of Order
Main Estimates 2018-19—Speaker's Ruling
The Speaker ... 20677

Fisheries Act
Bill C-68—Time Allocation Motion
Ms. Chagger ... 20679
Motion ... 20679
Mr. Doherty ... 20679
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20679
Ms. Boutin-Sweet ... 20679
Mr. Doherty ... 20680
Mr. Cannings ... 20680
Ms. Gladu ... 20681
Mr. Dusseault ... 20681
Mr. Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) ... 20682

Mr. Doherty 20682
Mr. Cuzner 20683
Motion agreed to 20684
Report Stage
Bill C-68. Report Stage 20684
Mr. Rogers 20684
Mr. Doherty 20685
Mr. Johns 20685
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20686
Mr. Schmale 20686
Mr. Johns 20687
Mr. Hardie 20688
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20688
Mr. Samson 20688
Mrs. Wagantall 20689
Mr. Johns 20690
Mr. Cannings 20690
Mr. Albas 20692
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20692
Mr. Cuzner 20692
Mr. Johns 20693
Mr. Scarpaleggia 20694
Mr. Dreeshen 20694
Ms. Harder 20694
Mr. Bezan 20696
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20696
Mr. Dusseault 20696
Mr. O'Toole 20696
Mr. Lamoureux 20698
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20698
Mr. Scarpaleggia 20698
Mr. Doherty 20700
Mr. Johns 20700
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20700
Mrs. Wagantall 20700
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20702
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20702
Mr. Johns 20702
Mr. Fillmore 20704
Ms. Gladu 20704
Mr. Hoback 20704
Mr. Johns 20706
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20706
Mr. Warawa 20706
Mr. Johns 20708
Mr. Hardie 20708
Mr. Dreeshen 20708
Mr. Albas 20710
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20710
Mr. Barlow 20710
Mr. Johns 20712
Mr. Hardie 20712
Mr. Fast 20713
Mr. Scarpaleggia 20714
Mr. Johns 20714
Mr. Genuis 20714
Mr. Lamoureux 20715

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

International Trade
Mr. Blaikie 20716
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20717
The Environment
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20717
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20718
Foreign Affairs
Mr. Genuis 20719
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20720

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes
à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca